The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1929 NUMBER 771

Contents

The Week 82

Editorials

Those "United States of Europe"..... 84
The Palestine War..... 86
The Coal and Iron Police Again..... 87

General Articles

The Sea Powers and the League..James T. Shotwell 92
Antigone and Prohibition.....John Jay Chapman 95
Ubi Ecclesia (verse).....G. K. Chesterton 95
Washington Notes.....T. R. B. 96
Diaghileff .....Gilbert Seldes 97
Liberal Club.....Byron Dexter 98
Texas Lights.....Stark Young 99
A Communication .....Robert Morss Lovett 100

Correspondence 101

Reviews of Books

Ordeal by Reason.....Robert Morss Lovett 104
French Pastry .....Howard Coxe 105
The Father of the House of Commons
Walter Phelps Hall 106
Church History.....Harry Emerson Fosdick 106
Two Ways of Approaching Lincoln
Raymond Holden 107
The Mighty Medicine.....Maynard Shipley 108
A Note on Aline Kilmer.....Clarence Britten 108
Notes on Novels..... 109

The Week

ON September 2 the tenth ordinary session of the League Assembly opened at Geneva. The settlement at the Hague of the reparation and Rhineland question has removed a cloud which threatened to engulf the meeting. Whether the gathering will be serene or whether it will steer into another storm the events of the next few days may reveal. The official agenda of the meeting is not exciting. It calls for the election of three non-permanent members of the Council and two judges of the World Court. Peru has announced her candidacy to succeed Chile as a non-permanent member of the Council. The leading candidates for the two world court positions are Sir Cecil Hurst and Professor Fromagéot, who are respectively legal advisers to the British and French Foreign Offices. The Assembly will also pass upon the report of the jurists to revise the World Court statute; and in so doing they must decide whether or not to accept Mr. Root's formula in regard to the American reservations. It is possible, moreover, that M. Briand will make good his promise to bring forth his proposal for a United States of Europe. For a number of years a Pan-Europe organization has been working for this ideal. It wishes to see the negotiation of continental treaties providing for compulsory arbitration and for free trade, and eventually for the establishment of a European parliament. M. Briand has committed himself to this general idea, provided the federation includes England and provided it is not directed against the United States. At first sight, the idea of a United States of Europe appears attractive. It would give European industries an unrestricted market of 400,000,000 people, and thus enable them to install the mass production methods which have made the United States so prosperous. The obstacles to a United States of Europe, seem, however, almost insuperable. As long as Germany is bound to pay reparations it is difficult to see how that country, which is the second largest in Europe, can play an integral part in any federation. Soviet Russia obviously would not come in. In the other countries, wide differences in economic and cultural conditions make union difficult. Finally, there is the question of England's position which is discussed in an editorial on page 84 of this issue of The New Republic. Greater progress is likely to come through strengthening international organization generally, such as the League of Nations.

THE agreement which was reached at The Hague between Philip Snowden and the other diplomats does not change the Young Plan in any of its essentials. His victory, though it brings Great Britain a substantial part of what he demanded, signifies a triumph for Britain's sense of justice more than it does the winning of significant material gains. Perhaps his most important objection—that against the undefined potentialities of the International Bank, aside from its strictly reparation functions—has still to be dealt with. The meaning of the whole affair lies rather in the change of direction in British foreign policy rather than in the immediate diplomatic triumph. Though France and Great Britain have an equal stake in European recovery, France has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hitherto played the role of the obstructionist, Great Britain that of the compromiser. The English have had to buy French acceptance of reasonable measures with a series of concessions. The Labor government apparently does not intend to allow France to employ these tactics any longer. It wants French friendship and is willing to coöperate, but it has served notice that it will not stand idly by if France attempts to win private advantages at British and European expense. If the result is to force the French to accept their rightful responsibility for European appeasement and economic growth, the future of international politics on the Continent may be more healthy.

AS THE Senate convenes to consider its Finance Committee's version of the new tariff bill, the most hopeful bit of news is that there has been formed a bi-partisan committee of women, to examine the necessity of the proposed changes from the point of view of the consumer. Mrs. George Orvis, formerly a member of the Republican National Committee of Vermont, who is chairman of the new consumers' committee, calls attention to the merchandizing axiom that women do the bulk of the nation's spending at retail; and are more directly interested than anyone else in what things cost. Though not, according to Mrs. Orvis, assuming at the beginning that the bill is undesirable, the committee "proposes to find out the reason for the increased rates. If they are necessary, naturally we won't complain. But we want to know why. At the House and Senate committee hearings every interest from the importer to the manufacturer was represented. The consumer was not considered. But we hope to be before the final bill is written and passed." Other members of the committee are Mrs. Daniel O'Day, Miss Helen Varick Boswell, and Miss Alice Hill Chittenden. We hope the committee will not overlook an inquiry into the desirability of that absurd section of the bill retained by the Senate which would prohibit the importation of revolutionary literature. This clause is an insult to American scholarship and intelligence. Surely we don't need protection against contamination by ideas. Surely the productions of native radicals are not an infant industry which needs encouragement.

AMONG the schedules of the Senate tariff bill is an item levying a 20 percent duty on boots and shoes. This, it is argued, is necessary to compensate the shoe manufacturer for the 10 percent duty placed on hides. Yet the Tariff Commission in a report on this subject has declared that a compensatory duty of 3.6 percent would be high enough on shoes valued at $2.50 made of hides at fifteen cents a pound, and that a rate of less than half this would be enough on shoes valued at $3.50. The duty in the bill is thus six to ten times as high as would be fair. In addition, there is good reason to believe that the duty on hides itself would be of only nominal benefit to the farmers. The shoe manufacturers did not present any such array of facts as would have justified their claim for protection. Few shoes are imported in any case; it is stated by the Rawleigh Tariff Bureau that the duty "is primarily for the benefit of a single manufacturer in Massachusetts who claims he is unable to sucessfully compete on a single grade of shoes with a single manufacturer in Czecho-Slovakia." If the shoe tariff were to be fully effective—as it certainly will not be on account of the competitive nature of the industry and the small volume of imports—it would increase the national footwear bill at least $150,000,000 a year. The consumers would fare much better to buy and dismantle the Massachusetts plant which wants protection.

MR. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES has accepted the position of honorary chairman of the campaign committee of Mr. Frederick Coudert, Jr., candidate for New York district attorney. We have no opinion as to Mr. Coudert's competence for this office, but we are seriously troubled by Mr. Hughes' willingness to compaign for him. We say this because Mr. Hughes is now a judge of the World Court. In fact, it was from the Hague that Mr. Hughes cabled his willingness to enter into this campaign. It would be manifestly improper for a judge of a federal court to participate in American politics. And the World Court statute says that World Court judges shall not exercise any "political functions." Now the word "function" is susceptible to a number of interpretations. Whatever its technical definition may be, there is little doubt that the faith of the nations in the judicial objectivity of the World Court would be shaken if all of its members engaged in domestic politics. A county compaign obviously does not have any international implications, but once a world court judge engages in politics of one variety, it is difficult to prevent him from going the limit. Indeed it is our recollection that despite his election to the World Court last September, Mr. Hughes took a vigorous part in our last presidential campaign. A feeling already exists in some international circles that it was a mistake to elect Mr. Hughes to the Word Court simply because he is the only judge who has also been prominent in political affairs. This sentiment fears that a court of politician-judges would lose that position of independence upon which popular confidence in any tribunal must depend. For the sake of his own reputation and for the future of the Court, we had hoped that Mr. Hughes would lean backward in removing the basis of these fears. Instead it looks as if he is falling the other way.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, governor-to-be of Porto Rico, has not yet taken the boat for his island post. When he does (or if he does) he will find a Socialist in control of both houses of legislature. Will he, in that case, pit his strength against that of the spokesman of 1,000,000 destitute laborers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1,000,000 out of a total population of 1,600,000)? A committee from the Republican party of Porto Rico came to ask the Republican party in Washington that question. They have informed Mr. Hoover and Co. that the Porto Rican Republican party is in coalition with the Socialist or labor party, led by Santiago Iglesias. They are dubious about young Teddy. Is he the right man for the job? In 1928, the leading faction of the Republicans allied themselves with Iglesias and his Socialists. Antonio Barcelo, head of the aristocratic Unionist party, joined with a reactionary group of Republicans, led by Tous Soto, Speaker of the Assembly. Although the Barcelo-Tous Soto alliance had a slight majority in both branches of the legislature, last fall—in a special session called by Iglesias to deal with emergency conditions resulting from the terrific hurricane—the Iglesias program was adopted. Barcelo meantime had a change of heart. The working people had proved their strength and had submitted, intelligently, to necessary political discipline. Barcelo became sympathetic with the Socialist party. This has enraged his ex-colleague, Tous Soto. Now they are busily planning ways and means of destroying each other. Barcelo has stated that he will join Iglesias and the progressive Republicans, at the next meeting of the legislature. In which event, Iglesias will be virtual dictator of the Porto Rican legislature for the remainder of its four year term. How well would young Teddy adapt himself to this situation?

A FEW WEEKS AGO The New Republic, in commenting upon a letter on the Mooney case sent to Governor Young of California by four members of the University of Oregon School of Law, expressed the hope that "others even closer to Sacramento will now feel that honor calls them to follow the same road." That hope has been partially gratified by a memorandum sent to the Governor by Messrs. Clore Warne, John C. Packard and John Beardsley of Los Angeles, showing in a convincing manner why Mooney should be pardoned. In a subsequent letter to the Governor, Mr. Beardsley makes an excellent point. He states that it is not merely the privilege, but the duty of the Governor to pardon in circumstances like these, because "Judge Griffin would have granted a new trial, after he learned of the perjury, if he had had the power. The law prevented his doing so. The judge is powerless. But the State of California is not powerless. It can grant a new trial, through the pardoning power vested in the Governor." Mr. Beardsley goes on to say:

> There is no statute of limitations on a murder charge. Mooney can be tried again at any time on the charge of murdering one of the other victims of the Preparedness Day explosion. If a jury can be convinced of his guilt he can be convicted and hanged. Thus it is clear that justice need not be cheated by Mooney's release, if in fact there is sufficient honest evidence to establish his guilt.

On this account, the letter points out, the Governor's own opinion as to guilt or innocence is not important. The important thing is to cease imprisoning a man convicted on the basis of what has definitely been shown to be perjured testimony.

Those "United States of Europe"

M. BRIAND'S aim of a "United States of Europe," which it is said he will explain at the present Geneva conference of the League of Nations, sounds at first like a long shot for so practical and level-headed a people as the French to take, even when led by their most internationally minded statesman. The suggestion has, in the realm of ideas, achieved a good deal of discussion and approval, especially since its formulation some years ago by Count Coudenhove-Kalergi. But the French rely on trusted and traditional resources in international affairs, no matter how much deference they may pay to imaginative logic in the intellectual world. Far from taking steps to unite Europe, they have, ever since the War, fostered the growth of new nationalisms to split and encircle their vanquished enemy; the "Little Entente" is far closer to a policy of domination than to one of unification. There are few signs now that the Quai D'Orsay intends to become virtuous and turn its back upon power politics. In fact, no step likely soon to be taken will do much to interfere with French habits in the world of international politics. What Briand realy has in mind is, at the beginning, something far more mundane—an economic conference which may prepare the way for a European customs union. There are behind this two obivous motives, which can be distinguished from each other in practice only with difficulty.

One motive is to remove the heightened barriers to trade which have cut Europe into writhing segments ever since the Armistice and have furnished the chief surviving embodiment of the destructive "war after war," concerning which we used to hear so much. Each new and old country, wishing to build up its own manufactures at any cost, has put obstacles in the way of imports. Such a policy is, of course, disastrous to the efficiency of Europe as a whole, and is inimical to those interests dependent on world trade and wide markets. Again and again Englishmen have protested against it. Special attention has been paid to those Americans who have advised Europeans that if they want to emulate our prosperity they must encourage continental trade as we have done. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Canadian to the Mexican border, no customs officials interferes with the free movement of goods in this continent. The fact has furnished the wide market which has made possible mass production of commonly used articles. Europe can never

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increase the efficiency of her production or her standard of living to match ours, unless she provides her producers with as wide and free a market.

The other argument is the complement of this, and is composed of fear and enmity rather than friendly emulation. It is by far the more commonly accepted, and seems to furnish the stronger popular support for M. Briand's suggestion. It points to us as a united economic empire which is preying on a divided Europe. We buy up her industries and properties; we levy on her governments and peoples for payment of war debts, we export our goods to her, and to her foreign markets, in ever-increasing quantities. But we refuse to allow her to make anything out of us in return. Not satisfied with a tariff which already shuts out all but a trifling percentage of imports, we are on the point of raising it still higher. Europe will become our vassal unless she takes drastic action. This view concentrates not so much on internal unity as on external defenses. It thinks, not merely of freeing the internal market of its stifling tariffs, but of erecting a wall of customs against the United States, from behind which new combinations and cartels can struggle against us in the rest of the world. France, leading a defensive and offensive alliance of this sort, might readily perfect a European hegemony under her leadership which would ensure her boundaries and her continental interests against aggression for years to come. This aspect of the matter, we may be sure, has not escaped the attention of those astute Frenchmen immersed in *real-politik* who might otherwise be expected to look upon a United States of Europe as an idealistic and idle dream.

But such a project must reckon with the position of Great Britain. Britain is more dependent on world-wide freedom of trade than any other nation; she has suffered more than any other from the restriction of European markets which has followed the War. She may therefore be expected to put her back into any joint efforts to reduce European tariffs, against which she has been complaining for so long. But she is justly afraid of the anti-American phase of the argument. Suppose the internal reduction should be accompanied by high tariffs against non-Europeans. There would be formed an economic system which Great Britain could afford neither to join nor to refrain from joining. If she joined it, her trade with the United States, with her dominions and colonies, with the four corners of the earth, would be jeopardized. She could not become part of a self-sufficient European system without splitting the Empire and undergoing far more painful readjustments than any she has yet experienced. She could not do so without becoming a second-rate power, a satellite of France. The thing is inconceivable. But she could not remain outside a high European tariff wall without being cut off from her nearest and best customers to the eastward, while to the westward she would be left looking mournfully at the spiked wall surrounding the United States. Her only recourse would be to build the imperial customs union long advocated by Tories. But in so doing she would meet the certain objections of the Dominions; and even if she succeeded, the product would be a scattered and illogical economic structure, far from self-sufficiency and doomed to inferiority in a mutually exclusive competition with the United States of Europe and the United States of America. British economists know this well, and the leaders of the Labor Party may be trusted to be fully conscious of the danger lurking in the Briand proposal. Aside from their knowledge of its possible consequences to their country, their international idealism would prompt them to struggle against any course of action which would lead to three competing world systems, constantly at each others' throats.

The New Republic earnestly hopes that the course of M. Briand's proposal for a customs union may take such a direction that the British will give to it the coöperation which they are so eager to extend to mutual tariff reduction. But if the proposal does not take this direction, we may see revived again the self-assertion of the British against French dominance in Europe which first stirred at the Hague conference on the Young Plan. If the French really are bent upon setting up an exclusive European economic unit under their leadership, no matter what happens to the British, we may count upon the determined hostility to it not only of Mr. Snowden, but of Mr. MacDonald himself, conciliatory in spirit as he is. And we may expect to see the Labor Cabinet backed with full force on this issue by British opinion of nearly all factions.

It is quite possible that the inherent difficulties of bringing about an agreement on tariffs among the European nations themselves will forestall the possibility of any such sharp issue. Most European manufacturers who control their home markets are not likely to understand the wider opportunities awaiting them under more free trade, no matter how logical the arguments for it may be. Nor are they likely to want to impose barriers against the cheaper foodstuffs which come to their working populations from other continents, in behalf of European agricultural producers. It may be impossible to achieve any agreement on tariffs at all. In this case Britain would be no worse off than she is now. But the risk is great that the widespread European fear of the United States may create a strong sentiment for economic alliance against us. For that sentiment the stubborn and reckless economic nationalism of this country is largely responsible. If we want to contribute our part to world unification and prosperity, we can do no better than to make a right-about face on our present insane tariff policy, and adopt a more coöperative attitude on all questions of international finance. The ultimate interests of the United States are scarcely less involved in the nature of the harvest that will grow from the seeds now being planted at Geneva than are the immediate interests of Great Britain.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Palestine War

FOR two weeks civil war has been raging in Palestine. At times this war has become a massacre, as the killing of defenceless Hebrew students at Hebron shows. Altogether more than a hundred Jews, including some Americans, have lost their lives. The Arabs have threatened Zionism with destruction. The Zionists do not intend, however, to be destroyed. On August 30, 20,000 people attended a mass meeting in New York, sponsored by 150 Jewish organizations. This meeting passed a resolution charging the Palestine authorities with "laxity, inefficiency, incompetence and criminal neglect, in failing to prevent the organization and arming of Arab mobs." It demanded the immediate restoration of order, the dismissal of incompetent officials, the punishment of guilty Arabs, the reorganization of the Palestine force so as to include a "large percentage of Jews," fullest compensation for Jewish lives and property destroyed; increased immigration into the country, a just settlement of the problem of the wailing Wall, and finally a restatement of British policy so as to make clear the intention of the British government to carry out its promise to establish in Palestine a Jewish National Home.

It is a curious fact today that the British government is being condemned for not being "militaristic" enough in Palestine. Except for a detachment of British gendarmes, virtually all British troops from Palestine had been withdrawn before the present revolt; and the policing of the country having a population of less than a million was in the hands of a force of between 1500 and 2500 men of which the Jewish police constituted about one-sixth. This force would be regarded as more than adequate in an African colony; but the Jews feel that in Palestine, the seat of tense religious and nationalistic feeling, greater precautions against outbreak should have been taken.

This criticism possibly may have validity. There is unanimous agreement that the first task of the British government is the restoration of order. Nevertheless Palestine cannot be pacified by force alone. There are underlying religious, economic and political difficulties which must be removed if peace is to be permanently maintained.

A dispute over the Wailing Wall was the occasion of the present outbreak. The Wailing Wall is a relic of Solomon's Temple; and from ancient times Jews have entered the narrow court in front of this wall to chant lamentations over the destruction of this Temple. Legally the Wall is Moslem property; in fact it is part of the property of the Mosque of Omar. The Moslems have long consented to the use of the Wall by the Jews; but during the last few years a controversy, which was even referred to the Mandates Commission, has raged over the actual privilege which the Jews should enjoy. Recently the British authorities allowed the Moslems to cut a door so as to connect the Mosque of Omar with the Wailing Wall area. This action infuriated the Jews; and as a result of further irritations, riots broke out, and the Arabs soon attacked Jews throughout the whole country.

The Wailing Wall controversy is merely a symbol of the fundamental antagonism which now exists in Palestine between Arab and Jew. From the day of Saul, son of Kish, down to the destruction of the Temple in A. D. 70, the nation of Israel played an important part in the history of the East. The memory of this history stirs deep emotions in the orthodox Jew even to the present day. It was the Psalmist who said, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning." Since the time of Christ the Jews have become scattered throughout the world; and many of them have been the subject of bitter anti-Semitic movements. For historic, religious and nationalistic reasons Jews have demanded a country of their own. In 1897 Theodor Herzl organized the first Zionist Congress. The fruit of this effort was the famous Balfour declaration of 1917 which pledged the British government to establish in Palestine a national home for the Jewish people. The League mandate which was later granted to Great Britain provided that a Jewish agency, which has become the Zionist organization, should advise and cooperate with the British authorities in this aim. Through the efforts of the Zionist organization, the Jewish population in Palestine has increased from 58,000 in 1919 to 150,000 at the present time. About half of this population is engaged in agriculture. Whether through the small-holder settlements or through the cooperative groups these Jewish farmers do not rely upon outside labor. They are attempting to establish a self-sufficient economic and cultural existence. As a result of Zionist efforts waste lands have been reclaimed, irrigation projects have been started, and the slender resources of the country generally developed. The Zionist organization has also installed a system of schools, including a university at Mount Scopus. The Hadassah Medical Organization has estabished hospitals and clinics through the country. For the first time since the destruction of the Temple, the Jews are in reach of a National Home. It is true that Jews throughout the world have been divided. But differences has been reduced by an agreement between Zionists and non-Zionists, reached last year. The intensity with which the movement is now supported is shown by the fact that the Zionist organization, which relies solely upon voluntary contributions, has a normal budget of more than $3,000,000.

The future of Zionism might well be serene except that Palestine is not an empty void. On the contrary, it is inhabited largely by a settled Arab population that, despite recent Zionist immigration, outnumbers the Jews six to one. The Arabs formed part of the Turkish Empire before the War. To induce them to revolt, thus aiding the Allies, the British government promised the king of the Hejas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that at the end of the War it would recognize the independence of the Arabs in the Middle East. This promise was not, however, carried out. The Middle East was divided up into the mandate of Syria held by France, and the mandates of Palestine and Iraq held by Great Britain. In no case were the wishes of the local inhabitants consulted in the selection of the mandatory power. And ever since, the Arabs have been indignant.

The task of the British in Palestine is the reconciliation of the conflicting interests of the Jewish minority and the Arab majority. The Balfour declaration of 1917 declared that nothing should be done in establishing a National Home for the Jews that would prejudice the "civil and religious rights" of non-Jewish communities. In 1922 the British government again made this clear by declaring that it did not intend to create a "wholly Jewish Palestine" nor did it contemplate the "disappearance or the subordination of the Arab population, language or culture." Naturally neither the Jews nor the Arabs have been satisfied with this policy. The Jews declare that the government has failed to give proper encouragement to colonization plans; that it has too severely restricted immigration; and that since the retirement of Sir Herbert Samuel as High Commissioner, local British officials have actually been hostile to the Zionist idea. The Zionists declare that they scrupulously respected Arab rights; that they have paid high prices for Arab land and for Arab labor. Without Jewish aid Palestine would remain economically stagnant. The presence of the Jews, it is urged, has raised the standard of living, and has brought to the Arabs educational and sanitary advantages whereas, without Jews, they would have lived in "barbarism."

The Arabs on the other hand have their grievances. They believe that the immigration of Jews has been out of all relation to the possibilities of employment; and they assert that the economic depression of the last several years has been due to excessive immigration. The Arabs fear, moreover, that if this immigration increases, it will not be many years before the Jews may even become a majority of the population. In a petition to the Mandates Commission in 1925 the Arab Congress of Palestine declared that the Balfour Declaration totally ignored the political rights of the Arab majority. The Jews, it was declared, enjoyed full rights of citizenship in practically every country of the world. But the Arabs had only the Middle East for a home. Why should they be ousted by alien colonists? The Arabs believed that the Balfour Declaration was inconsistent with the League Convenant and should be repudiated.

In 1922 the British government attempted to conciliate the political demands of the Arabs by proposing to establish in Palestine a legislative council consisting of ten elected and ten official members. Of the ten elected members eight should be Moslems, two Christians and two Jews. The Arabs, however, demanded a clear majority of all seats. And as a result no legislature has been established to the present time.

Behind the specific grievances of the Arabs lies a growing national consciousness. This national awakening has been stimulated by a sense of betrayal by the Allied governments after the World War. Given the proper opportunity, it is quite possible that during the next few generations the Arabs will travel the same political road that Turkey, India, and China have traveled during the last few years. The outstanding Arab leader, Ibn Saud, king of the Nejd, is already talking about the establishment of an Arab federation, uniting the Arabs of Iraq, Syria, Palestine, Transjordania and Arabia proper under a common government.

It is not Zionism so much as Allied jealousies which prevents the establishment of such a federation. Nevertheless, as long as Arab ambitions are unjustly thwarted, the difficulties of the mandatory powers will increase and sooner or later the League of Nations, which has general supervision over these areas, will be held responsible. Any suggestions in regard to the Near East should be made in the most timid and tentative fashion. It is reasonable to believe, however, that the present disaffection of the Arabs might tend to disappear if the British and French governments agreed to amalgamate their mandated areas into an Arab federation under some outstanding native leader such as Ibn Saud. Any such step should be taken only upon the understanding that the right of the Zionists and of other minorities should be maintained under continuous international guarantee. The establishment of an Arab federation would be a blow to the political Zionists. But in view of recent events and of the general facts in the situation, the Jews should realize that there are distinct political limitations to Zionism; the Arabs, on the other hand, should realize that minorities have rights which must be respected.

The Coal and Iron Police Again

THE reason why the coal and iron police have been useful to the Pennsylvania coal operators is that they are immediately effective in fighting trade unions. The 1929 law substituting industrial police for coal and iron police is inadequate because it does nothing to check the use of state-commissioned police in breaking strikes. The recently issued regulations for industrial police by means of which the Governor of Pennsylvania claims to have rendered impossible abuses like those of the past simply fail to meet this issue. It is to be hoped that the widespread protest which was voiced against the old system will crystallize into open opposition to the acts of the sinister and cynical Republican machine which now controls the Commonwealth.

Most Pennsylvania employers find the local police adequate for breaking up picket lines, inter-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fering with strike meetings, and arresting organizers, during the period when a union is trying to get established. It is true that steel employers hire coal-and-iron policemen as company guards, and sometimes also as spies on union organizers and Communists, but they have little interest in the continuance of the coal-and-iron police system as such. Guards without a state commission would serve quite well for the steel mills. In great crises, like the steel strike of 1919, the state police have served the employers faithfully. It is in the coal areas that local and state police are alike inadequate for the operators' purposes in time of strike; for the number of mines in Pennsylvania is greater than the maximum number of state police allowed by law, and local police forces are far too small and too much contaminated with sympathy for strikers to do their duty as an employer sees it.

During the coal strike of 1927-28, the coal and iron police ran wild over western Pennsylvania, cracking heads, terrorizing coal communities, entering miners' houses and tent colonies, and (ably seconded by the state police) making difficult the way of the militant trade-unionist. Their depradations culminated last February in the killing of John Barkoski, which act was called by one Pittsburgh daily "the most brutal murder in the history of Allegheny County." The public became very eloquent in its demand that the coal and iron police be curbed by law. Governor John S. Fisher, a former coal attorney, who had been deaf during the strike to all protests about police brutality, merely suggested that the Governor be given wider powers of control, and his Attorney-General, himself a large owner of coal properties, drafted a law having this effect.

The western Pennsylvania liberals, headed by the Pittsburgh branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, had different ideas, and proposed concrete reforms along three principal lines. (1) Coal and iron police should be bonded for their acts. (2) They should be limited to the industrial property of their immediate employers. (3) Greater care should be exercised in their selection. The campaign of agitation failed, and the Attorney-General's bill was enacted into law. As finally passed, this measure provided a bond (of only $2,000) for each man, and made certain perfunctory changes in the method of selection. It also altered the name from "coal and iron police" to "industrial police" and conferred on the industrial police all the powers and prerogatives enjoyed by Philadelphia policemen and by constables of the Commonwealth. A similar measure which would have limited the territorial jurisdiction of the police was vetoed by the Governor, who announced, however, that "these private police should not and will not be permitted, by regulations under preparation, to exercise a roving authority."

Territorial limitation was probably the most important question involved in the reform of the coal and iron police. The failure to include it in the law was a glaring error which the Governor could easily have prevented. In the rules which he later issued, the Governor has made a show of correcting this error. Regulation One is as follows: "Industrial police must confine their activities as such strictly to the protection of the property and facilities of the concerns for which they are respectively appointed and to the preservation of order upon or in connection with such property ar facilities."

Could anything be vaguer or more indefinite? The limitation to the "protection of the properties and facilities of the concerns" is no limitation at all. Independent coal operators can easily form associations, as they have in the past, and in the Governor's regulations, such associations are specifically authorized to employ industrial police. Thus industrial police can be mobilized, as were the coal and iron police, wherever a union organization campaign is under way. These privately paid police may enter the houses of coal-miners "to preserve order" (!), and they may hold their prisoners, as the coal and iron police held Barkoski, without the necessity of bringing them immediately before a magistrate for commitment to jail.

Not only in Pennsylvania, but in other states as well, the policing of industrial disputes has been an open scandal. The prevalent system of commissioning *ad hoc* deputy sheriffs who are paid directly or indirectly by the companies concerned, is wrong in principle, and has been productive even in Pennsylvania of abuses fully as grave as those charged against the coal and iron police. The preservation of order during a strike is usually not difficult if the job is tackled in the right way by the right men. But as they have been constituted in the past, our preservers of the peace have provoked more strike violence than they have prevented. The cringing attitude of bodies like the Coal Commission, which recognized that strikers were being deprived of their civil rights and suggested as a solution that the union should not force the issue, in effect delays a settlement of the problem. The only way to reform a system by which officers of the law are paid by private companies, is to abolish it.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1929, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN GEORGE SOULE
EDMUND WILSON STARK YOUNG R. M. LOVETT
T. S. MATTHEWS

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY WALDO FRANK
ALVIN JOHNSON E. C. LINDEMAN ROBERT LITTELL
LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL
LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Sea Powers and the League

I

A FORMER ambassador of the United States to one of the great powers of Europe has recently published in an American weekly which claims the largest circulation in the world, an article in which he challenges the whole direction of the peace movement of the post-war years.[1] He maintains that the real path to world peace lies through the agreement of the three great powers that control the seas—Great Britain, the United States, and Japan. The League of Nations in his eyes is an ineffective gesture. The veto upon war lies in the hands of the great sea powers; let them plan together to use it. Let the United States, as the most powerful of them, make a new start. The League may be kept alive for minor things, but the vital decisions for preserving peace should be kept where they belong.

The central idea advanced in the article in question is not so much an attack upon the League of Nations as an attack upon an historical American attitude in international relations; for it is largely due to American initiative and insistence that the problem of international peace has been discussed in these post-war years in universal terms. The common phrase "world peace" was forced into the councils of the "associated" powers at a time when the only other country which used the phrase in common speech was the chief enemy, Germany. There was, perhaps, an equal tinge of unreality in both cases; *Weltfriede* being an ideal of a hard-pressed nation whose motives in fighting the war had been bitterly assailed; and "world peace" being the slogan of an isolated nation which, waging a war to end war, naturally conceived of "world peace" as the antithesis of "world war."

But the real meaning of the American insistence on universality was that it offered a way for action without involving us in the fortunes of any other country. In particular, it fitted in with that strange but ingrained reluctance to be too thick with the British Empire, even if we were engaged in fighting a common foe. Only the mistakes of Germany made possible the extent of cordial coöperation with the western powers which came about, upon our entry into the war. The United States has felt that its people are drawn from too miscellaneous a collection of nationalities for it to accept without reserve the position of an ally against people who are of the same stock as many of its citizens. There was, therefore, a very sound political reason for the United States to fight the war only for principles of universal application and to insist, as it did, that the structure of peace should be for all the world.

But the idea that the structure of peace should be applicable to all nations and not merely the private possession of a privileged few does not imply that it is any the less definite in its application. The instrument for world peace created at Geneva, embodying the American concept of universality, could not and does not function in generalities. The problems of peace are as definitely localized as those of war. Peace is not a vast repository of good intentions; it is a geographic as well as a political fact. It rests upon the solution of a multitude of little things and although it extends over more territory than the most far-flung battle front, it is none the less a theatre of action in which each nation plays its own part in its own way. Universal peace is the sum total of peace here and there throughout the world, peace in the Balkans, in the Caribbean, in Asia, Europe, or Africa. It means that some definite frontier still stands intact; some possible encounters did not take place. The problems of peace are as specific as the issues that threaten it, and they call for a study of the appropriate means for settling them when and where they occur. The problems of international peace are those of practical politics in its most practical form. If war is the concentration of controversy, peace, as the veto upon war, must be as capable of concentration and application in given areas as between given disputants.

Our ex-ambassador asserts that in the specific cases when the League is called upon to act, it is not only impotent itself but positively harmful in that it keeps the nations which compose it from taking the one effective way to outlaw war, namely, to make their combinations against a specific outbreak of war. The only generalization that he considers necessary is to have the three great sea powers join together and put their veto against war anywhere in the world; with their control of the seas they will be able to block others and with their agreement among themselves they will be able to maintain peace upon the seas. This, he implies, is the direct and effective way, as opposed to the roundabout measures of the League. That it would be effective—for a while—is beyond denial. As things stand now, Great Britain, the United States, and Japan could control the shipment overseas of most of the necessary raw materials, supplies, and munitions of war, without which no belligerent could long survive in the industrial war of today. If the great naval powers agree to do so, says our critic of the League, they can stop any major war between civilized nations.

[1] "A Veto of War" by Richard Washburn Child, published in the June 22 issue of The Saturday Evening Post.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At first sight this seems to be a common sense statement of a practical solution, but when we begin to examine it we find difficulties from the very start. If the great naval powers agree to stop a war they must agree upon the direction of their action, which means that they must all be willing to place responsibility upon the same nation and be equally willing to take the consequences of joint measures against the aggressor or joint help to the victim. If one thinks of these sea powers as acting like trustees of the Paris Peace Pact, we should not forget Mr. Kellogg's insistence that there is no such undertaking envisaged in the Pact itself. On the contrary, he insisted in the strongest terms that each signatory was to judge for itself whether or not the Pact was violated by the act of others and what it should do about it when the event happened. A veto upon war by the three sea powers could not therefore be carried out in the terms of the Treaty itself, for if each one was free at any moment to decide against the judgment of the others, either for or against imposing a veto—that is to say, using embargo or blockade, or some such means, against another nation—then the whole proposal would break down.

It is obvious that with or without a League of Nations there must be agreement among the great powers, or the international action to prevent war is definitely impossible. Geneva seeks to establish this through political action in the Council of the League; the proposal now before us would substitute unofficial negotiations in the world of business and finance. Bankers and chambers of commerce would meet to ensure the continuance of the peace-time relations of the world of business, and their guarantee of peace would hold so long as the "politicians" could be kept out of these matters of international business. Governments, he claims, should step aside to allow the realistic forces of peace to work peacefully and constructively; and so there would be an end to intrigue in the dawn of fair dealing by those who are directly interested in seeing the right thing done. Now whatever reservations there may be in public opinion about the organization at Geneva, they are slight indeed compared with the chances of having a scheme like this accepted. The day has passed, so far as this country is concerned, when international affairs can be abstracted from the responsibilities of government. We may make mistakes in the art of government, but we are not going to lessen its scope on that account and, more especially, we are not likely to lessen it in such fundamental problems as those of war and peace. As a matter of fact, the scope of government both at home and abroad is being steadily enlarged with the development of the electorate, and the pessimist who thinks that we are managing our affairs worse on that account should study the history of this or any other country to see how great has been the advance in capacity, paralleling the extension of the field. In any case, the argument against too much interference of government in domestic affairs has never been seriously applied to foreign policy. There the aims are those which interest the common man more and more, and the only safety lies in an enlarged intelligence which comes through political education. There is no safety in Fascism, even of the business type, and the problems of war and peace will eternally revert to the sphere of politics and within it to the action of responsible governments.

II

That there is no progress to be made by scrapping the League of Nations in favor of a triple entente of the great sea powers should be evident to anyone who has studied the drift of politics in both of the other two, the British Empire and Japan. Anxious as Japan has shown herself to be on the best of terms with the United States, and loyally as she has met our advances, it must not be forgotten that she enjoys at Geneva a recognition and a standing of the greatest value to her. In her permanent membership on the Council she has the advantages without the embarrassments of power. Seldom do questions touch her there which call for explanations on her part, while her disinterested observations of European politics bring her increasing prestige, a prestige still further increased by the judicious and statesmanlike use of her opportunities. It could not be expected that she would surrender this situation for anything which the United States could offer, for it seems hardly within the range of possibilities that we could offer that kind of entente which would be in substance a defensive alliance against war.

The case of Great Britain is by no means so simple, but the ultimate conclusion would be much the same. If the United States were to offer Great Britain an entente which would in substance make the English-speaking nations of the world the guarantors of peace to control the seas, it is not likely that either British pro-Leaguer or British unregenerate imperialist would hesitate to accept the offer. It would not even need close definition to make it acceptable for British foreign policy to deal in realities and not in words. But, because the British deal in realities to a degree unparalleled in the political world elsewhere, they know from the start that such a proposition is impossible. It is impossible for Britain because it would invite an alignment of continental European powers to offset the British-American entente; and, much as Great Britain is drawn our way by both sentiment and interest, the proximity of Europe must enter into all its calculations. The Channel and the seas which once gave England its security do not exist for the air forces of the continent and the proximity of danger in war as well as the advantages of nearby markets in time of peace stand in the way of any wholly non-European orientation of the Empire.

The interest of the Dominions in the League of Nations is something like that of Japan. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

League has raised their status in the eyes of the world and acknowledged their nationhood while they still retain the ancient loyalty of the British Crown. The idea once cherished by Sir John MacDonald, the Canadian statesman, that there might be a kingdom of Canada within the Empire has substantially been realized in another way. The Dominion which is most conscious of this is Ireland, whose representatives at Geneva have from time to time symbolized their independence by the use of Erse or French instead of English. To be sure, if Ireland by itself were offered an entente with the United States as an alternative for Geneva there would hardly be any doubt as to its choice, but the proposal is not that Ireland or Canada or any other part of the Empire should detach itself from other ties and form an American-Dominion entente; it is the Empire as a whole, the British Commonwealth of Nations, with which America would be dealing.

There is no need to argue this point in detail. British statesmen have no more idea of transferring the center of their negotiations from Geneva to Washington than have the Japanese; and any American proposal which is based upon this hope is both uninformed and misleading.

This being the case, any measures which the three sea powers may take to put their veto upon war must be in harmony with the Covenant which two of them have signed, and which contains a provision that they shall never become parties to any treaty or engagement which runs contrary to it. Time and again the signatories of the Covenant have reasserted their loyalty to it, and all plans for "world peace" must be shaped with this in mind. The Kellogg-Briand Pact was examined from this point of view before adherence was given it, and any effort to "put teeth into it" will be similarly scrutinized.

But it is a wholly false idea of the League to imagine that it bars the way to regional understandings or groupings of a few nations by themselves, if the purpose of these arrangements is to further peace. On the contrary, the League has always encouraged such plans, and has stimulated them. The negotiations of the Treaty of Locarno were the direct outgrowth of discussions in the Council of the League, although the germ of the idea came from without. Sir Austen Chamberlain seized upon it as a substitute for the Protocol of 1924, and it could not have succeeded but for the use which it makes of the League machinery to decide concerning its observance. There is a whole network of arbitration and conciliation treaties, covering almost every European nation, providing for the erection of a score or more of tribunals or commissions in whose appointment and functioning the League has no part, and yet over which the League extends a definite approval.

Take the case of Switzerland. The present Swiss President, M. Motta, presided over the Assembly of the League in the historic sessions when the Protocol was voted. Aware of the difficulties which confronted any such far-reaching, universal scheme of war-outlawry, he took the step, as Foreign Minister of his Republic, of making "all in" arbitration treaties with as many different governments as would accept. Incidentally, it has been stated on good authority that his offer was rejected by the Government of the United States because of the precedent it might establish, of arbitration without reservations. The Senate stood in the way of any such engagement. Most European countries, however, not only accepted the Swiss offer but made treaties with their other neighbors of the same kind.

Now the important point for the United States to notice is that these regional or limited agreements erected machinery for the pacific settlement of international disputes, machinery quite independent of Geneva. A whole series of Conciliation Commissions came into existence, similar to those of the Bryan Treaties. The recent treaties of the United States with South American powers are along this line, and the League, far from regarding this procedure as a rival to its own, hails it as supporting it.

There is, therefore, no reason why the three sea powers should not come together for the purpose of putting "their veto upon war" so long as their action, which is in support of the League's fundamental principles, is not directed toward substituting for it a new and rival machinery. As a matter of fact, as I have previously pointed out in The New Republic, there is already a precedent which carries us much more than half-way. In 1922, at the Washington Conference, Great Britain, France and Japan agreed with the United States in what is known as the Four Power Pacific Pact as follows (Article 1, Section 2):

> If there should develop between any of the High Contracting Parties a controversy arising out of any Pacific question and involving their said rights which is not satisfactorily settled by diplomacy and is likely to affect the harmonious accord now happily subsisting between them, they shall invite the other High contracting Parties to a joint conference to which the whole subject will be referred for consideration and adjustment.

Article 2 of the same Treaty extends this procedure, or one similar to it, to cover a wider field:

> If the said rights are threatened by the aggressive action of any other power, the High Contracting Parties shall communicate with one another fully and frankly in order to arrive at an understanding as to the most efficient measures to be taken, jointly or severally to meet the exigencies of the particular situation.

Here we have a different device from the commissions of conciliation or tribunals of arbitration

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which are the common European complements for the machinery of the League. The conference method is to be employed for the maintenance of peace within the Pacific area. The ten-year period during which this treaty was to remain in force will soon be up. It should not be beyond the ingenuity of diplomats to enlarge the commitment so as to call for conference, or "full and frank communication," between these same signatories, not merely in case of a controversy in the Pacific, but in case of a violation of the Multilateral Treaty of Permanent Peace. This would furnish a guar-

antee ld-
wide to
identica ent,
the kind o n is
made in terms king
the Four Powers in Pact
of Paris, a method of the claims gning
the three great naval upon
war which would be new theme ith their
own foreign policy and of the Greek ments of
Britain and Japan under the which pre- venant of the
League of Nations. the person of King JAMES T. SHOTWELL.

Antigone and Prohibition

IT was only the other day that I began for the first time to look carefully into the "Antigone" of Sophocles, the most famous and by common consent the greatest and the most beautiful of the Greek tragedies. Nothing was farther from my mind than that the ideas of this play could have any bearing on modern political problems or on current events; and I print this paper merely as a memorandum on the effect which the play produced upon my own mind.

The plot of the "Antigone" is of stark simplicity. When the play opens Thebes has barely repulsed the Argive army after a terrific siege, on which two of King Kreon's nephews have been killed, one of them in defence of the town and the other in the ranks of the Argive enemy. They fell in mortal combat with one another, and the action of the play turns upon whether these two brothers—the patriot and the traitor—shall be treated with equal honors in their interment.

King Kreon has decreed that the traitor brother shall receive no funeral, but be left unburied where he fell, to be devoured by the vultures. This was, to Greek feeling, the worst punishment imaginable, for it deprived the dead man of any chance of happiness in the next world and, as it were, consigned him to hell. Kreon has, by his edict, made it a capital offense for anyone to perform the usual mystic rites over the body. This edict was sound law, for Kreon was a tyrant and there were no limits to his authority.

Antigone, the niece of the King and sister of the fallen brothers, disobeys the ukase and is condemned by the King to be immured in a cave ar left there till she dies.

The theme of the play, to which every spee it and every chorus is devoted, is the conf tween the injunctions of positive law and t of private conscience. This was not a

commonplace, and the arguments against tyranny to which the theme gives rise had been developed into a sort of philosophy, which was built up and buttressed as a protection against arbitrary rule. By the time the Greek tragedies were written every one in the audience understood every plea that could be urged in defence of tyranny or against it. The thing that strikes a modern reader is the astounding accuracy and the astounding profundity with which the Greek intellect had analyzed the whole subject.

The sympathies of the audience were, of course, on the side of limiting the King's authority. But what was there to rely on? There was no written constitution or Bill of Rights to protect the people and they were thrown back upon antiquity. They appealed to the dark, mystic, ancestral, domestic Religion of the Hearth, which antedated the Age of the Tyrants in Greece and outlasted the Roman Republic in Italy—the worship of Vesta and of the household gods.

These gods were a special, peculiar and subordinate class of divinity—the Gods of the Dead much less decorative than the gods of co Greek fiction and very much more them that Antigone makes he the play. She states her si feeling and shows tha only by a pa ror at do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

person of Antigone appeal to vague, spiritual mysteries; to inheritances; to the spirit of the age, or the spirit of the ages; to the dictates of human experience, common sense and common humanity.

I will give a few excerpts from the dialogue to show the clash of the ideas that are involved in it. Kreon is speaking of the traitor brother.

KREON: Him—so I have decreed—no tomb shall clasp
No voice shall wail; but he shall lie—mere corpse—
A mangled meal for dogs and birds of prey.

CHORUS: Such is thy pleasure, O Menoecus' son,
Touching this city's friend, and enemy.
Thou hast the power to take what course thou wilt
As toward the dead and as toward us who live.
.....
What is the further duty you enjoin?

KREON: Not to consort with those who disobey.

CHORUS: What man so foolish as to wish to die?
.....
(The proof is then produced that Antigone had performed the usual rites over the body.)

KREON: (To Antigone.)
But thou! Speak briefly: in few words!
Knew'st thou the edict had forbidden this?

ANTIGONE: I knew it well. Why not? It was an edict.

KREON: But thou didst dare to overstep the law?

ANTIGONE: It was not Zeus above who framed that law,
Nor Justice whispering from the Underworld.
Nor deemed I thy decrees were of such force
To o'erride the sanctities of heaven—
are not of today, nor yesterday.
—whence they first issued no
holy rites,
gods,

II

In reading the Antigone I was thus confronted with Antigone's large appeals to the authority of world-wisdom and natural piety as against local statutory laws, and I cast about in my mind for a modern example or familiar precedent where some similar appeal had been made against an analagous statute.

About twenty-two hundred years after the Antigone had been exhibited at Athens an agitation against domestic slavery arose both in England and America. It began in about 1750 and lasted for about one hundred years. Then the United States gave to slavery a rather belated *coup de grâce*. At the time that our Constitution makers of 1789 were innocently incorporating slavery into our fundamental law, the world at large was beginning to decide that slavery was an infamous and intolerable nuisance; and this discovery could not long be kept out of our country. It soon began to stir the consciences of the Northern States and kept on stirring them till slavery overshadowed all other subjects and created a new era in America. The antislavery people denounced the United States Constitution, and the chief cause of their hostility was, as we know, the law which made it the legal duty of every American to return a runaway slave. There was nothing to be said against this law except that it violated every instinct of human charity and religious feeling. It called upon men to trample on their better nature.

The great spectacular conflict in America between slavery and antislavery came in 1850 and was staged in the Capitol at Washington. The ultimate outcome of the controversy was the greatest tragedy in real life that is known to history, namely, our Civil War. Now let us imagine an historical drama thrown into the form of a Greek tragedy, and representing the controversy as it stood in America in 1850; though for the sake of the larger view I shall use one famous speech taken from an earlier period of the great controversy.

Mr. George Ticknor Curtis, Webster's biographer, shall appear in the character of King Kreon, who argues for the statute concerning the return of fugitive slaves. I will merely change Ticknor's first word "We" to "Ye," because he is speaking to the Chorus. The italics are Ticknor's.

KREON: *(In the person of Ticknor.)*
"Ye have seen the character of what may be called the *religio*-political philosophy by which many individuals and some men in public station undertook to set up private judgment of what the law of God ordains in opposition to the positive commands of the fundamental law of the land." (1)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> provisions of this law, and such provisions appear to me . . . absolutely necessary if we mean to fulfil the duties positively and peremptorily enjoined upon us by the Constitution." (2)

Antigone's reply to these arguments shall be given in the words of Curran, the Irish orator, in his famous speech on the Rowan Case (1794), a speech that went into our American Readers and books of declamation and became a by-word with the antislavery people. The passage exerted a vast influence upon the popular mind of the North between 1830 and 1850.

> ANTIGONE: I speak in the spirit of British law, which makes liberty commensurate with, and inseparable from, the British soil—which proclaims even to the stranger and sojourner, the moment he sets his foot upon British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated to the Genius of Universal Emancipation. (3)

As may be seen in the foregoing cases of Kreon and of Daniel Webster, your Tyrant always insists that all laws are of equal moral authority. The trouble is that you can never force sensible and humane persons to believe this—not even by fines and penalties; no, not by dungeons or the stake.

There is another aspect of the whole course of the international agitation against slavery, which will interest those who believe in the immortality of personal influence—a thing that is philosophically indubitable, but is rarely visible. The influence of private persons upon public law is a consecutive, coherent force, and passes from character to character and from incident to incident in the history of every nation. The orator Curran in the speech above quoted was referring to the leading British case of Sommersett, which had been decided in England on June 22nd, 1772, after a tremendous agitation and at the close of a tremendous lawsuit. Lord Mansfield in the name of the whole bench then gave the decision that "as soon as a slave set his foot on the soil of the British Islands, he became free." Both agitation and lawsuit were the outcome of the insensate activity and persistence of one man, Granville Sharp (1735-1813), a man of good family, self-educated, who represented an irrepressible and enduring force, the same force that afterwards inspired the antislavery people in the United States. But the link is closer still. A phrase out of Curran's speech, "The Genius of Universal Emanicipation," was adopted in 1821 by Benjamin Lundy for his antislavery journal, published at Mount Pleasant, Ohio; and Lundy it was who walked from Baltimore to Bennington, Vermont, to see Garrison, and persuaded him to devote his life to the antislavery cause. The three men, Sharp, Lundy and Garrison were so similar in type of mind, character, and natural power, that they coalesce into a single stream of historic influence. Their function was that of the Hebrew prophet and of the Greek soothsayer. In this especial matter of the world-movement for the extinction of slavery they were personal expressions of a single blast of historic power. Thus the hand, not only of Garrison, not only of Lundy, but of Granville Sharp can be seen guiding the hand of Lincoln when he penned the proclamation that freed the slaves.

In the old Greek analysis of the situation which arose between a tyrant and his people there is always another element, the element of the tyrant's pride. He cannot bend, or be reasonable. "There is a trace of impiety in him," thought the Greeks. He must have been singled out by the gods for destruction—cursed, as it were. His wits are a little touched. Hence the Greek proverb "that whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." All this rationale of Greek thinking was made in the endeavor to see light through a very dark business—the psychology of self-will. This element of insuperable pride, a pride that survived the Civil War, survived even the discovery that the defeat of the South was a blessing, was seen in the mental attitude of the leaders and followers of the Old Confederacy, and shines in the eyes of any of them who may be alive today. These men had sacrificed their all on the altar of an idea; and the notion of self-sacrifice is so deeply bound up in the human breast with a consciousness of virtue that men are often satisfied and consoled if they give up their lives in upholding a mistake. I note this feature of the conflict between statutory law and world wisdom because it would seem that the advocate of the statutory law is always unteachable. He knows he is right. His mind is a little petrified.

On the Greek stage it became a pleasing and instructive entertainment to show the perversity of human nature as symbolized in a single tyrant, and to consign him to ignominy and defeat. But in a case arising in real life, where the mental attitude of the tyrant exists in half the population of the state, the consequences are dangerous. In the Greek theater the sacrifice of a saint like Antigone thrills the hearts of the audience and clarifies their minds without the shedding of any real blood. But where the case arises in real life, real bloodshed follows. Antigone is a myth: Joan of Arc is a real woman. At the present moment, for instance, and in the case of our prohibition troubles, the bloodshed is real. It has begun promptly, and what course it may run is as yet unrevealed to us. One may note also that a most encouraging touch of lunacy has already showed itself in our Prohibition tyrants. There is nothing in Kreon's edict or in the Fugitive Slave Law so extravagant as many provisions of our Jones Law. That law seems to have fallen upon Senator Jones's cranium straight from Olympus.

The hard feelings that have arisen over the enforcement of our Prohibition laws are no new thing upon the earth. This fact is made very clear to us

(2) Life of Webster II 423.

(3) Life of William Lloyd Garrison by his Children, I., 141 n.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forcement of our prohibition laws are no new thing upon the earth. This fact is made clear by a glance at the Antigone of Sophocles. Indeed hard feelings and rigidity of conviction are the great dangers to which all parties are exposed. An experiment, as Mr. Hoover would call it, is being tried, and we must endeavor to keep our minds open to receive the solution, whatever it may be. The idea, even of bloodshed, should not terrify us. The Hebrew philosophy, that source of large human wisdom and of experience in government has an aphorism, "Without shedding of blood is no remission." Now "remission" to the Hebrews meant remission of sin and reconcilement with God. But if you will allow the word remission to mean a letting go of anger and a return to good feeling among citizens, you will see that it covers our case. I cannot help greeting the bloodshed that dogs our liquor question as a good sign of the times. There is no danger of civil war. It did not require a great war but only a moderate sacrificial sprinkling of blood in a few of the Southern states to bring about in 1878 the final nullification of the Reconstruction laws.

The contest of factions over prohibition will probably end in a stale-mate—the law being enforced in districts where the people want it and to the extent that public opinion supports it, and being neglected elsewhere.

You ask, what good will come of this? Why, the good will be that our people have been softened and enlightened by a great human experience as to the nature of law, and the relation of law to custom and to popular life.

In this present contest between the Hearth and the Scepter both parties will soon or late drop their revolvers and shake hands over common sense. As to the condition in which this outcome may leave certain unenforcible but legal statutes of the United States, this is a small matter compared to the step forward that has been accomplished—namely, a greater maturity in the American brain.

JOHN JAY CHAPMAN.

Ubi Ecclesia

"You must seek a castle east of the sun and west of the moon."

"For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."—*St. Matthew, XXIV. 27.*

Our Castle is East of the Sun
And our Castle is West of the Moon
So wisely hidden from all the wise
In a twist of the air, in a fold of the skies,
They go East, they go West, of the land where it lies
And a fool finds it soon.

Our Castle is East of the Sun
And abides not the law of the sunlight
The last long shot of Apollo
Falls spent ere it strikes the tower
Far East of the steep, of the strong,
Going up of the golden horses,
Strange suns have governed our going,
Strange dials the day and the hour.
With hearts not fed of Demeter
With thoughts unappeased of Athene
We have groped through the earth's dead daylight
To a night that is more, not less:
We have seen his star in the East
That is dark as a cloud from the westward
To the Roman a reek out of Asia
To the Greeks foolishness.
For the sun is not lord but a servant
Of the secret sun we have seen
The sun of the crypt and the cavern
The crown of a secret queen
Where things are not what they seem
But what they mean.

But our Castle is West of the Moon
Nor the Moon hath lordship upon it
The Horns and the horsemen crying
On their great ungraven God:
And West of the moons of magic
And the sleep of the moon-faced idols
And the great moon-colored crystal
Where the Mages mutter and nod:
The black and the purple poppies
That grow in Gautama's garden
Have waved not ever upon us
The smell of their sweet despair
And the yellow masks of the Ancients
Looking west from their tinkling temples
See Hope on our hill Mountjoy,
And the dawn and the dancers there.
For the moon is not lord but a servant
Of the Smile more bright than the sun
And all they desire and despair of
And weary of winning is won
In our Castle of Joyous Garde
Desired and done.

So abides it dim in the midmost
The Bridge called Both-and-Neither,
To the East a wind from the westward
To the West a light from the East:
But the map is not made of man
That can plot out its place under heaven,
That is counted and lost and left over
The largest thing and the least.

For our Castle is East of the Sun
And our Castle is West of the Moon
And the dark labyrinthine charts of the wise
Point East and point West of the land where it lies
And a Fool walks blind on the highway
And finds it soon.

G. K. CHESTERTON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

IF a more surprising, not to say painful, development has occurred in Washington in this generation than the suspicion and distrust with which certain regular Republican high protection Senators, their manufacturing friends, Tariff League lobbyists, press agents and propagandists are beginning to regard Reed Smoot, the venerable Senator from Utah, widely known as the "high priest of protection," I cannot now recall it. It sounds absurd, but it is none the less true. Not only that, but there is some basis for the suspicion, quite a little ground for the distrust. It has, in fact, become the town joke. For years Senator Smoot has been the most unwavering and zealous of all protectionists. Higher, always higher, was his aim. Those members of his party in the Senate who faltered as he pressed onward and upward in the tariff struggles of the past seemed to Mr. Smoot unpatriotic, weak, not real Republicans. Perhaps it does him an injustice to intimate that he no longer has faith in the Republican tariff policy as the real bulwark of the nation's prosperity.

It is not, however, going too far to say that the Smoot support of the pending tariff bill, as reported by the committee of which he is the chairman, has about it less zeal, ardor and enthusiasm than any other for which he has been called upon to fight in all his long Senate service. On the surface, of course, he is for it. On the floor of the Senate he will champion and defend it. Yet it is no secret that in the Senate Committee he voted again and again for the lower duty in preference to the higher, that he thinks there is not at this time any call in the country for a general revision upward, such as is contained in the bill, that primarily and almost exclusively he is interested in the sugar schedules. The rest mean practically nothing personally to him and in his heart he doubts the political wisdom of the sort of bill now before the Senate, will not be bowed down with grief should it be shot to pieces—even should it not get by at all. Of course, this is by no means the public attitude of the Senator from Utah. As chairman of the Finance Committee he will defend the bill, do all he can to secure its passage, fail in no particular to do his duty as a "high priest of protection." Further, he would scornfully repudiate the suggestion that he is lacking in enthusiasm about this bill. What has caused the modification in the Smoot views is difficult to say. Perhaps one reason is the lack of real interest in the general bill on the part of the really Big Business of the country, which in the past has so dominantly insisted upon tariff legislation, and which not only has been but still is potent in the Republican party, though not nearly so much so under Hoover as under Harding and Coolidge.

Perhaps also Senator Smoot has been intellectually charmed—some of his colleagues say hypnotized—by the President. Mr. Smoot has served in the Senate under a considerable number of Republican Presidents, not one of whom was ever remotely like this Republican President in his mental processes. Two long talks has Mr. Smoot had with Mr. Hoover on the subject of the tariff—one at Miami before his inauguration, the other at the President's week-end camp in Virginia, where on Fridays with a few selected friends he hurries away from the Washington heat to fish, meditate and confer. In July on one of these holidays Senator Smoot was in the party, and on the authority of another member of that party I am told that Mr. Hoover and Mr. Smoot talked tariff for hours and hours. Further, I am told that what Mr. Hoover fed Mr. Smoot was figures, and Mr. Smoot loves figures. He revels in them. He prides himself on being able to digest them. He is a figure hound. Wise Mr. Hoover did not argue with him. He did not attempt to win him over, or point out the error of his ways. He made neither threats nor promises and, so it is said, never once touched on politics. All he did was to talk as one economist to another, but at such length and with such effect that when Senator Smoot came back to Washington he was not only happily gorged on figures and facts but had actually gotten a new light on the subject in which he is saturated and on which he had no notion a new light could be had. If Mr. Hoover did all this to Senator Smoot up there in the Virginia mountains it was certainly something of a feat. But whether he did or not, the Smoot attitude toward the pending bill is today such as to make it practically certain the real fight to put the measure through will be led by that stalwart young advocate of Mr. Vare, that eloquent defender of Mr. Mellon, that earnest friend of the people—David A. Reed of Pennsylvania, whose soft heart aches over the prostrate condition of the plate-glass industry of Pittsburgh and believes in protection with a capital P.

But, to get away from the tariff, than which there is no duller subject, and into the livelier field of practical politics, it interested me no little the other day to hear upon unimpeachable authority that the President mourns greatly about the utter lack of party leadership in New York State. He is, I am informed, greatly disappointed that no real leader has developed there in the last six months. He considers it important from a party standpoint, which is the same thing at this stage of the game as a personal standpoint, that there should be a strong party leadership in this, the greatest State. For a while he had hopes of Machold, but these have not been justified. Apparently it just isn't in him. From what I gather, if there were any man in the party who stood out as the logical leader, who by dint of political ability and skill had worked himself into a strategic party position, Mr. Hoover would back him with the full weight of the White House for the sole purpose of insuring party order and decent direction of party affairs. Moreover, his friends say he would not much care who the man was. He would of course prefer a friend, but rather than see the present flabby, feeble, disordered and discouraging state of affairs continue indefinitely, if among the men who were not for him at Kansas City there appeared a leader, he would welcome him. The trouble is there is none now and none in sight. You can go through the whole list—pro-Hoover and anti-Hoover—and there is not a single one who so much as looks like a leader—that is a leader whom anyone would follow. The Republican party in the State is not much better off than the Republican party in the city. It has in the organization little brains, less spirit and practically no sense of direction. It is not in condition to make an effective fight. The reasons this situation disturbs the efficient Hoover sufficiently for him to put his massive mind upon it are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

easy to understand. Next year—1930—in the State of New York a Governor is to be elected. Should the Republicans win it will not only be a general encouragement to the party for the 1932 national campaign in which the probabilities all are that Mr. Hoover will again be his party's Presidential candidate, but it will eliminate as his probable Democratic opponent the present Governor of New York.

It may not turn out to be important to Mr. Hoover's chance of succeeding himself that a Republican Governor be elected in 1930. On the other hand, the practical politicians, who I must admit are very often wrong, think it is. At any rate, it would, for the purposes of the nominating convention in 1932, be extremely comforting to Herbert to have a party leadership in New York upon which he could depend to deliver the big vote of that State, instead of having to worry and fret and sweat about it the way he did last year. With New York against him the situation might not be pleasant for the President. A strong and friendly leader in the State, who would definitely shelve the wholly uncongenial and much distrusted Mr. Hilles and take over the party direction, would be a great comfort to Herbert. Perhaps if the Republicans find a good man as a gubernatorial candidate and elect him, that would be the answer. If, to the patronage power of the Governorship is added the White House backing, the right sort of man ought to be able to make himself the leader. The trouble is to find the right sort of man. Anyone who thinks that Herbert is not giving this situation considerable thought does not know Herbert. The idea of the great party to which he has been devoted for now nearly nine years being in such an enfeebled and futile condition in the greatest State is a matter of real concern to him. He does an extraordinary lot of thinking about an amazing variety of things—New York politics is one of them.

T. R. B.

Washington.

Diaghileff

SERGE DIAGHILEFF, who died recently at the Lido, was a startling example of the virtue of compromise in the arts. Superficial observers of the Russian Ballet considered that its esthetic principles were a compromise between the traditional choreography and the new; and everyone who knew anything of the social and financial situation was convinced that Diaghileff trimmed his sails to every wind of fashion in order to make money.

I am not sure that the second of these accusations is false. When I last saw the Ballet, three years ago, the influence of popular French scenarists and composers had seemed dominant; because there was nothing new of Stravinsky that year and because the programs were often light and "pleasing," I felt that Diaghileff was allowing the Ballet to disintegrate. Yet in that season I was able to see the "Sâcre" and "Noces" and "Petrouchka" and "Punchinello" and half a dozen other masterpieces of the Ballet's youth; some of the dancing was exquisite, although Lifar hadn't reached the stature of a Nijinsky or Mordkin; and when he devoted the ballet to serious work, Diaghileff allowed nothing of the second-rate, nothing cheap or mean.

That was the purpose of his compromises. He had launched and kept alive a supremely fine institution and he was determined that it should not die; he was ready to borrow from anyone, to accept any patronage, to make any concession, in the justifiable confidence that nothing could corrupt the essential thing in the ballet. He had seen Isadora Duncan with her great talent go down to defeat a dozen times because she could not live with the world. Her art was far more personal than that of the Russian Ballet; her appetite for martyrdom was great. To Diaghileff the romantic clichés about artistic integrity meant very little. He had begun as manager of a troupe supported by Imperial Russia and despatched to France as part of propaganda for a loan or an entente. It mattered very little to him that Society bought all the tickets for his galas, or that poor artists couldn't afford the price of seats on opening nights, or that people called him bourgeois, or that Otto Kahn had to make up the deficit of the American tour. In his public life he had a single ambition: to carry on the ballet. He succeeded.

He was not himself an artist in any usual sense. He knew music, played the violin, was interested in painting. The quality that carried him close to genius was the intelligence that guided his eclectic taste. He created the new ballet with Fokine, but he never parted with the Italian ballet-master who carried on the ancient tradition of five-position dancing, and worked out the detail and remembered the steps of every one of the great "modern" numbers which Nijinsky or his sister or Mordkin or Fokine invented. The break with the old tradition was, in fact, entirely superficial. Diaghileff's ballet returned to the pure art of the past, discarding the corrupt dancing of meaningless technical display, and working on the sound principle of the pantomime-ballet, that every movement must express an attitude of mind or a part of the action.

The intelligence which persuaded Diaghileff to keep toe-dancing—as in "The Spectre of the Rose"—side by side with the masses and group movements of "Petrouchka," also persuaded him to discard as rapidly as possible the lifeless settings and the dull costumes of the ballet of the 1900's. The "Oriental Imagination" of Bakst was a decisive influence on the Ballet, for music and movement had to be keyed up to the flashing color and the excitement of the settings and costumes Bakst designed. Except in "Thamar," a neglected masterpiece of the Ballet, Bakst always has seemed to me second-rate, but his influence was none the less desirable. It gave the Ballet its propulsion toward artistic life, away from the pale monotony, relieved by technical tricks, in which it had too long dragged out a wearying existence.

It was Diaghileff's great virtue that he went on. Long before Bakst died, Diaghileff was employing other artists: Larionoff and Gontcharova began with the ballet when they were as extreme as the surrealists are now; Picasso was still a "wild man" when he was commissioned for his first work. Among the composers Stravinsky stayed with the Ballet longer than any other because he, too, went on, because he could proceed from the folk music of "Petrouchka" to the folk music of the "Sâcre" and "Noces" and set the mark of his genius on everything he did. In choreography, the same thing is true. Even the tremendous

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

successes were never allowed to become rigid, and each new first-dancer was allowed to rework the "Afternoon of a Faun," just as each new choreographer could present a new version of the "Sâcre."

This spirit of change and growth was Diaghileff's great contribution; next in importance was the establishment of harmony between the three great arts he had to combine. It was because he felt the integrity of music and choreography that he was never led astray into the field of "interpretative dancing." He was impressed by Isadora Duncan, but kept his own dancers in the more rigid, the less personal tradition, never allowing them to interpret the music or to express what they felt, and always compelling them to create the dance as an art separate from, but associated with, music. From time to time one heard protests against the odd settings and the bizarre costumes supplied by the painters; in the end they were recognized as appropriate—they never existed without relevance to the ballet, they never tried to explain what either the music or the dancing made clear in its own right.

In the new ballets of Soviet Russia, in the well-intentioned Swedish Ballet, and in Germany, Diaghileff made his influence felt; but the Ballet has not overcome the theatre and the opera, and in America, which has developed dancing without choreography, the Russian Ballet can only be seen as an indirect influence—in a certain liveness in the theatre, in the great advance in physical beauty of both theatre and opera. It is a great pity, for the ideas of which Diaghileff was the animator and impresario are particularly acceptable and particularly needed among us. If he had come in 1926 instead of 1916, he might have revolutionized our stage; he would certainly have re-animated our opera; and he would have seen in our ordinary professional dancing the raw material of a choreography—a dancing with meaning—which none of our native masters has discovered.

Reports that he was coming have been frequent in the past few years; he was comparatively a young man, and seemed to feel that he had all time at his disposal. Now that he is dead one wonders whether the Ballet can continue to live; and one wonders also what can take its place if it dies.

GILBERT SELDES

Liberal Club

THE newest liberal club convenes behind the marble columns of the oldest debating society in the fourth oldest American college. It is mid-winter Alumni Day. Across the road in the gymnasium the basketball team convenes with the team from the third oldest college. Every seat in the wooden stands and on the running track is occupied; but, strangely enough, so is almost every chair in the hall of the debating society. The undergraduate chairman is nervously pleased; he had hoped for fifty people; nearly two hundred have come. One third of them are undergraduates. They cluster in groups, watching the alumni with suspicion. They cannot quite make them out. They do not look like liberals. To which upper-class eating-clubs did they belong? Of the assembly, only certain of the professors, wearing the familiar suits of clothes that have been on view for two, or three, or four years, seem to be "the type."

A pink-cheeked boy, cheerful, white-shirted and blue-suited, speaks first for the undergraduates. "My subject is the liberal activities on the campus. If I keep to my subject, my speech will of necessity be very short." He keeps to it for a few more sentences and gives it up. The alumni laugh and applaud.

First speaker for the alumni, a capitalist, good for page one of any newspaper as the spokesman of his particular industry, good for page one, second section, in his own right. He is well-fed, ruddy, with a dispassionate air that may be caution or boredom. He defines liberalism as the realistic approach, looking to the future, generalizes briefly on foreign affairs—isolation is impossible . . . alliances are impossible . . . drifting is dangerous . . . we must have a definite foreign policy. He sits down and lights a cigar. No one has taken offence.

Next, a professor of economics from another university. He slides his tongue rapidly across his lower lip between phrases, stands rigidly with his hands in the side pockets of his coat, slants his head over his left shoulder, reads fast and confidently. His paper has been carefully written. He touches on the dwindling gold supply—fifty percent less in fifty years—analyzes the Mellon taxation policy . . . harder on the poor than on the rich—proposes certain changes in banking laws . . . for a more mobile credit. He seems to know his facts. He is through.

An engaging young man four years beyond his Ph.D., who smiles charmingly and enunciates clearly, rises to define a liberal as one whose attitude is non-dogmatic and forward-looking, and attacks the Farm Problem. He takes off the capital letters, rearranges the subject as farm relief, gets down to cases with certain proposals. Another well-prepared paper. The audience is appreciative.

With the next speaker controversy looms. He is an historic college rebel—in the fourth oldest American college rebellion means calling the upper-class eating-clubs undemocratic. Being handsome, well connected, a good fighter, with the prestige of having turned down the "best" club, his revolt was less ignominiously defeated than some of the others. Now he is up and coming at the bar. He defines liberalism as a regard for the individual; he hopes that there will be a decisive split at the next Democratic party convention; he believes that the Al Smith following is the hope of a liberal party in America; he tells a story that makes everybody laugh: the legislature of a Southern state was discussing an illegitimacy bill . . . a lady member protested against the use of the word bastard . . . the chair ruled that bastards did not exist in that state. . . . Indignant query: "What's become of the 10,000 Democrats who voted for Hoover?" . . . The controversy does not materialize.

The last speaker is a Socialist. When there is no danger of Socialist candidates being elected, he is popular with his classmates. His hair is white, thin over the top; the skin is drawn tight over his cheek-bones; he is lean-bodied and his shoulders curve a little; relaxed, before he is on his feet, he looks burned out. He rises, hooks his thumbs in his vest pockets, smiles, remarks that he had met the capitalist downstairs before the meeting and learned that the capitalist had had to do a good deal of explaining to his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

friends when they heard that he was going to be on the same platform with this Socialist. "It's going to be a lot harder for me to explain," observes the Socialist. He has a fine speaking voice; and he hits just the right tone for this meeting; he uses the word liberalism with a delicate implication of quotation marks—but he has a kind word for the idea behind this club. He is alarmed at the lack of belief in the possibility of intelligent political action in America today. He talks rapidly and easily, snapping his jaws together and pausing, now and then, for a quick half-smile. His audience is most attentive. He mixes facts and eloquence nicely. Statistics on prosperity . . . facts on the necessity of social control . . . satire on the probability of a Democratic opposition . . . friendly words for Al Smith . . . a note on the pronunciation of the word *raddio* in presidential elections . . . Tammany Hall . . . vote of the Democratic senators in the matter of Roy West . . . And so on to Socialism. Once again, just the right tone for this meeting: "Perhaps I'm wrong, but . . ."

He gets a big hand. The meeting is thrown open for discussion. A stockbroker questions the professor of economics; to everyone's surprise, the professor turns on him with both fluency and information and the stockbroker retires. More applause. The alumni are warming up. They are beginning to twist about in their seats, to examine the occupants of the chairs behind them, to indulge the personal curiosity instinctively restrained earlier in the afternoon, but which by now—since any person here is a potential speaker and may just at the moment be rising—is quite permissible. There is an air of expectancy. Perhaps some one will start an argument. If so, now is the time.

A man of about fifty is up at the rear of the room. He is tall and stiff, square-jawed, straight-lipped. He wears a starched collar, clipped with a gold pin; his voice is deep; he traces a slow pattern over the heads before him with an impressive introductory gesture. With his first syllable his chin lifts pugnaciously. Quick whispers throughout the room identify him. His message comes:

"I believe that there is an excellent possibility for the development of a progressive movement . . . in the manner of 1912. . . . Contrary to general belief, the present situation is not hopeless but most encouraging. . . . "

BYRON DEXTER.

Texas Lights

III. The Bishop's Trees

WE have been standing under the little cupola, or dome, of San Francesco, and the old gentleman who knows a great deal about the history of San Antonio has been telling me how it is the oldest portion of the cathedral and how Philip II., by royal decree, established it as the official center of the town. That seems a long time ago, I say, and he tells me another story of earlier days. Do I know, he asks, about the bishop's trees?

Not so long ago, less than a century by a good deal, there were no trees in the city save for a row of chinaberry trees that stood in front of the bishop's palace. One day they were going to hang six men and so took them and hanged them from these trees of the bishop's. The bishop was enraged and had the trees cut down, so that in all San Antonio there were none at all then. He did not mind hanging the men, but he would not have his trees exposed to such usage.

Visiting Poet

I have been hearing of Mrs. K——'s visitor last winter, the poet-reader that, through some club correspondence connection, she had invited to stay at her house when he came to make his lecture. For reasons of his own he felt sure of his welcome and so stayed on and on, speaking a great deal of himself and his works. But the main point was that a few days after his arrival he brought to her a poem he said he had written in her house; he declared this poem to be the best of his work so far. He asked her opinion on it and was grieved to hear that she could not understand what it meant. This, he said, made him feel that if she could not tell its meaning he could not expect others to. Her husband tried also, with no result, but that, it seems, was less surprising. Would she try it again? the poet asked. Day after day he asked if she yet understood, and day after day stayed on. Then, after a week, his next engagement called him away. For a last time she tried and failed on the poem; and so he tore it up, saying that it must be a hopeless failure. She has just bought his newest book of verse, and the first thing she saw in it was the poem.

New Luxury

The M——'s ranch is twenty-eight miles from town. It is a rambling place, made cheerful only by the carefree furnishings and the fact that you may throw your hat anywhere. It is, in fact, furnished mostly in horses, with environs of goats and cattle. You sit in easy chairs made of split wood and leather, or you can ride in any one of the five automobiles that the family races about in. You wear boots and old shoes and khaki shirts, if you choose, and drink a great deal of black coffee. One Sunday not long ago, when they were going to have ice cream, the cook, once a cowboy, found that some mistake had been made in the ice; too little had been delivered, or too much had been used, or had melted. They telephoned into town and had some ice sent out by airplane.

Magic Carpet

A friend has been telling me of a ranch in one of the western counties. It belongs to a friend of his father's. This old man, coming to Texas with my friend's father, outstripped him long since by prosperity with his cattle, and some years ago by oil gushing up overwhelmingly from the wells that had been sunk on his land. What with many millions, he had himself an architect out from Chicago and a giant contractor who could put him in the way of a real house. The house went up, and there was a great saddle lodge to the front of it, and a gallery for the blooded cows, where they were bathed three times a day and their tails put up in bags. The horses were the finest in the country; the ranchman and his five sons rode like mad. Indoors there were many rooms, tiled baths,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

patios, halls and rooms for family and guests. Nothing was spared. The only trouble was that whenever the sons or their father wanted a saddle blanket they went in and cut a strip from the carpets.

The Angelus

Almost at the edge of town we have stopped at the stand of The Barbecued Pig for a cold drink. Behind the counter a young lady in a flowered dress, short and rash, with her stockings rolled down to the tops of her high-heeled slippers and her legs burnt brown, is chewing gum and snapping the covers off of the bottles. A pleasant, honest-faced boy stands outside in a white apron, ready to bring the drinks to passing cars. You can have coco-cola, or Hippo and Nehi in all flavors, and root beer.

We sit there for a long time, everything considered, the passing by, the distant hoots and horns and bells, the bright voices and whirring wheels, and watch the world in its automobiles. Big cars go by, small cars, roadsters with college boys and girls, the boys in sport clothes, the girls in rouge and bare arms; families go by with collies sitting on the running-board, rattling cars with families in bathing suits going one way with dry hair, the other with wet; Mexicans rush vertiginously past, soldiers in groups also, and now and then a truck loaded with Mexican families, most of them standing up and looking out across a kind of pen built onto the truck. Old people sit on back seats looking jaunty as new hemispheres; cars full of colored riders pass and repass; and Fords full of children or farming people. People stop for drinks at our stand, or to get out and eat *chile con carne* or *tamales,* and across the street people are eating the same thing, and then there are cold drinks again a hundred feet down the road. Two radios are going in two of the stands, one playing an overture from some opera and one telling how you make me laugh, don't make me cry, with the trombone crying after the voice leaves off for half a line.

Two cars alongside us begin to talk; a lady, that is, leans out of her seat and says to the neighboring lady: "Won't you tell me your name?" Then she tells the neighboring lady, who gives her name with evident reserve, and says she is from San Marcos, how she has arrived on four different occasions at her old homestead, because she had word that members of her family had been found dead in their beds, four of them. All heart disease—seemed like there wasn't another family in Texas with heart disease like her family. The passing rattle and swish of cars goes on. Does everybody in America ride, I ask myself; has everyone a car? Has another golden age begun? Is the time coming when everybody is out, streaming through the bright, fresh air, passing under trees, through town, past each other, buying, camping by rivers, hurrying through meals at home to go somewhere, having plenty to eat, bearing breezy, restless children who will soon drive cars of their own, stopping for innocent drinks, wearing outrageously transitory fabrics, always getting something new, demanding luxury, baths, change and speed? Is ours the happiest little country in the world?

Then all of sudden the angelus sounds from the mission across the fields, not so far away. The picture of that place comes freshly into my mind, the old enclosure that the friars made, with its crumbling walls, the aqueduct after two centuries running water still, the little court inside the gate, with its bare earth and dry leaves, its sharp shadows and quiet lights, the church with its stations of the cross, its saints in their robes and draperies of linen and cotton and silk, the high, long windows against the leaves outside, the stillness and fading, gentle light. In the façade hang the three Spanish bells, and the little girl comes to ring the Angelus on the right-hand lower bell; its clapper is beaten flat with years of ringing. She has a pattern to follow, and looks serious as she strikes it through. The sound of the bell spreads out over the still, shining country, far away.

The bell gathers to itself all things: this hour every day, of the sun, of life, of quiet, golden light before night comes. It is strong with its associations, it is a unit, and makes time and the moment a reality and a permanence. This is the bell and the hour of poetry, of homesickness, of homecoming, the child to his mother's knee, the wanderer home, the evening star, still pastures, far seas, an ancient religion dwelling like a mother in men's hearts.

But the people riding everywhere in those cars have dropped all this. What new forms and units and poetries will they evolve, or will they think for a while yet, like strange, stale children, that man can live by bread alone—speed, comfort, plenty of things?

Stark Young.

A COMMUNICATION

The Pulitzer Prize

SIR: The statement that Mr. John R. Oliver's novel, "Victim and Victor," was unanimously recommended by the jury for the Pulitzer prize for fiction is perhaps technically correct. As a matter of fact, it was not the unanimous *first choice.* In the past, in cases where the preference of members of the jury has been divided, it has been the custom to rate the several choices by marks, 3, 2, 1, and recommend to the trustees the novel which received the largest total. I presume this procedure was followed in the present instance. The trustees have a right to reject the recommendation of the committee. That they exercised the right on this occasion was unfortunate, because of the implication that their action was due to the accident that the decision of the jury became public before it had been officially confirmed. It was unfair to Mr. Oliver. Certainly his novel will stand comparison with several of those to which the award has been made in recent years by the jury, with no revision by the trustees. I am glad to say this in spite of my gratification that Mrs. Peterkin should have been honored for a novel which I placed higher in literary merit than Mr. Oliver's.

There has been considerable doubt in the mind of the public, and in that of the jury also, as to the strictness with which the terms of the original gift were to be regarded. These terms, it will be remembered, prescribed the novel setting "the highest standard of American manners and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manhood" and "reflecting the wholesome atmosphere of American life." Subsequently it was made known to the jury that what was really wanted was the "best novel" of the year. Superlatives are always dangerous, but I doubt if they are more so in the first case than in the second. It is perfectly clear what Mr. Pulitzer meant by restricting his offer to a particular class of fiction. The novel with a purpose of social reform or "uplift" has always occupied a distinguished place in English fiction. Professor Cazamian has recognized it in his book "Le Roman Social en Angleterre."

If the prize had existed in England in the nineteenth century it would have been awarded on occasion to Dickens, to Charles Kingsley, to Mrs. Gaskell, to Charles Reade, to Mrs. Humphry Ward. Mr. Pulitzer's terminology, indeed, suggests the attitude toward the novel taken by Dickens in certain of his prefaces, and the example of Dickens may well have been in his mind, in drawing his specifications. Undoubtedly, the selection would often have been the subject of adverse comment, and called for defence, a result by no means at variance with the manifest purpose of the donor. I remember that when the jury recommended Mr. Sinclair Lewis' "Main Street," the late Stuart Pratt Sherman defended this action on the ground that the book actually did more to bring under discussion the state of American manners and manhood and the atmosphere of American life, with the effect of improvement, than any other book for a generation. On this occasion, also, the trustees overruled the jury and awarded the prize to Mrs. Wharton's "Age of Innocence." The book was to be preferred to "Main Street" on technical grounds, but as it dealt with a period half a century earlier, only a confirmed reactionary could have recognized it as meeting Mr. Pulitzer's conditions.

The discrepancy between the terms of the gift and the actual selections in the case of both novel and drama prizes has naturally called forth unpleasant comment. Last year the president of the Authors' League recited the terms and gave the names of recent winners, to the confusion of the juries and, I hope, of the trustees. I do not think I was too severe in suggesting to the latter that an elementary responsibility of trustees to a trust was to avoid making it ridiculous. I am assured that Mr. Pulitzer gave the Advisory Board of the School of Journalism power to modify his conditions. Such modifications should, of course, be given publicity. The last official statement which I received (December 5, 1928) reads as follows:

> For the American novel published during the year, *preferably one* which shall best present the whole atmosphere of American life, $1,000.

Mr. Oliver's book certainly does not present the whole atmosphere of American life; nor (except on a very cynical interpretation) does Mrs. Peterkin's. Clearly, it seems to me, the novel indicated for 1928 was Mr. Upton Sinclair's "Boston." If one may revert to the original terms, what novel has ever presented a higher standard of American manners and manhood or womanhood than Mr. Sinclair in his heroine, Cornelia Thornwell? And certainly no novel has dealt so comprehensively with American life, the rich and the poor, the native and the alien, the victors and the victims, and the composite atmosphere in which they live.

Chicago, Ill. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

CORRESPONDENCE

Puritanism, Prohibition, Catholicism

SIR: In The New Republic, August 21, Alice Warren objects to George Young's statement: "The success of prohibition in America is explained by the Puritan origin of its society, just as the resistance to it is exemplified in the Roman Catholic reaction." Her objection calls to mind the words of the Divine Master to James and John: "You know not of what spirit you are." As a matter of fact, Mr. Young's formula is substantially correct. If Mrs. Warren will turn to the chapter on Prohibition in André Siegfried's penetrating and illuminating study, "America Comes of Age," she will find convincing evidence that prohibition originated in, was foisted upon us by, and receives its main support from Puritanism. The spirit of prohibition is the authentic spirit of Puritanism; that is, satisfaction with oneself and a restless urge "to purify the life of the community and uplift the state"; the spirit which puffs a man up, as Mr. Siegfried says on page thirty-four of the same book, with "the idea that his duty toward his neighbor is to convert, purify and raise him to his own [that is, the Puritan's] moral heights."

Directly opposed to all this is the spirit of Catholicism. The latter cherishes individual liberty in all things which are not forbidden, explicitly or implicitly, by the revealed law of Christ or the moral law of nature. Since Catholic ethics does not accept the shallow doctrine that the consumption of intoxicating liquor is *per se* wrong, the Catholic spirit is averse to that fundamental interference with liberty which is inseparable from national prohibition. On the other hand, it favors temperance always and total abstinence whenever that is the only adequate safeguard against abuse of intoxicants. But it wishes the abstinence to be accepted by the free act of the individual, not imposed upon him by the state. The difference between the spirit of Puritanism and the spirit of Catholicism is concretely illustrated in the methods and personalities of Bishop Cannon and Father Mathew. The former would compel men to be even as he, would make them sober by force for their own good; the latter sought to persuade men that they ought to abstain as a free act of self-denial. Mrs. Warren intimates that Father Mathew believed in prohibition. This is one of those statements which are "important if true." So far as I know, it is not supported by the evidence of history.

Not only the Catholic spirit, but the Catholic heritage predisposes the average member of the Church unfavorably toward national prohibition. Very many Catholics have supported "local option," and even state prohibition when it was demanded by a considerable majority, when it was not opposed by any considerable and compact minority and when the laws did not aim at making it utterly impossible for those men who wanted liquor badly to obtain it. Before the Eighteenth Amendment most American prohibition regulations were of this general character. In many lands and for many centuries the Church has been in a position to observe the working of coercive civil ordinances, particularly those of a sumptuary nature. During this long period she has obtained a pretty accurate notion of the possibilities and the limitations of this kind of legislation. And her practical judgments and conclusions never originate in naïve desire or fond emotion. Sharing in this precious heritage of experience and of realistic thinking and his belief in the intrinsic worth of every human individual protect him against being fooled by the attempts,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether made by Puritans or by industrialists, to identify national prohibition with social welfare.

There is no "large society of Catholics favoring prohibition." The secretary of the association to which Mrs. Warren refers testified before a Senate Committee a few years ago that its total membership was considerably less than five hundred in the entire United States. If the number has since increased, the fact has not been revealed. At any rate, the organization functions mainly on the official stationery used by its secretary.

Nothing that I have said in the preceding paragraphs should be construed as implying that a good Catholic cannot be a sincere believer in the Eighteenth Amendment. Here, again, the Catholic spirit is the spirit of individual liberty. No Catholic who thinks that national prohibition is morally right and socially beneficial need fear the disfavor of his Church. On the other hand, there are some Catholics who acquiesce in national prohibition because they think it unwise to antagonize what they conceive to be dominant public opinion. Even these may possess their souls in peace; they will not be rebuked by the authorities of the Church. They might well ask themselves, however, whether the cause of human liberty and human rights is not of more enduring importance than conformity with temporary and misguided public, or pseudo-public sentiment, and whether the inevitable failure of prohibition might not be achieved with less agony if all who realize its falsity and its enormity would permit their views to become articulate. In the long run genuine expediency is identical with right and truth.

JOHN A. RYAN.

Washington, D. C.

Mr. Roosevelt in Error About Hawaii

SIR: In two short paragraphs on Hawaii in his recent volume, "The Restless Pacific," Nicholas Roosevelt makes numerous errors, some of which ought not to go uncorrected. He attributes the "Japanization of Hawaii" "to the failure to enforce restriction a generation ago," stating that "in 1900 there were only 12,360 Japanese in Hawaii." The actual number, by census, was 61,111, or 39.6 percent of the population. In 1928 only 38.5 percent were Japanese.

He adds that the Japanese now outnumber the Americans nearly 10 to 1. Who are Americans? There were 228,276 American citizens of all races in 1928. Even if by "Americans" he means only native-born Caucasians, excluding soldiers and sailors, persons of Japanese race outnumber Americans only 2½ to 1.

"The Japanese stock," he says, "will soon be able to outvote the Americans." It will be "comparatively easy" for the "Japanese party in Hawaii" to "take political control of the islands."

Apparently he believes that the Japanese will have a majority of all votes. In the first place, there is no Japanese party in Hawaii. Recently two citizens of Chinese ancestry were elected to the legislature, one, a Republican from a district where his racial group had only 5 percent of the voters and the other, a Democrat, in a district with 14 percent of Chinese ancestry. No citizen of Japanese ancestry has been elected to office, but a few young men have received a considerable vote. Some hold appointive offices, and when they are a little older others will be elected—elected as Americans by Americans.

Persons of Japanese birth or ancestry now constitute 38 percent of the population and the percentage is steadily falling. Alarmist predictions made ten years ago that they would cast 28 percent of the vote in 1930 have not been half fulfiled. They furnished 10.5 percent of the registrations in 1928, and some time they may cast about 25 percent of the total vote.

Mr. Roosevelt refers to the lessons of reverence for the divine ancestry of the Japanese Emperor taught in the Japanese-language schools, and questions the loyalty of the group. Formerly the only available text books were those used in Japan, with their customary teachings about the Emperor, but, for the past seven years, new books edited and published in Hawaii have been used, and the children now read about Washington and Lincoln instead of the Emperor.

As to loyalty: The alien Japanese owe their loyalty to their own country—Japan. Not so the Hawaiian born. There is no more doubt as to the loyalty of citizens of Oriental than of European ancestry. The Americans in Hawaii do not with "stupidity" and "intolerance" treat the "American-born Americanized Japanese as foreigners." They vote, hold office, teach in public schools, practice law, serve in juries, serve in the National Guard and hold commissions as reserve officers.

The race problems of Hawaii are not all solved, but misinformation about them will not help either Hawaii or the rest of the country.

Honolulu, T. H. ROMANZO ADAMS.

Mr. Roosevelt Replies

SIR: Mr. Romanzo Adams has rendered me and my readers a service by calling attention to a misprint which had escaped me in preparing "The Restless Pacific" for the press. The figure of 12,360 Japanese in Hawaii refers to the census of 1890, not of 1900. It does not in any way after the meaning in my book.

As for his figures of population for 1928, they cannot, of course, be accepted as authentic, as no official census has been taken since 1920. These figures show that the percentage of the Japanese population was 42.7 (U. S. Fourteenth Census, Volume III, p. 1172.)

In so far as the statement that the Japanese outnumber the Americans 10 to 1 is concerned, it is quite obvious from the context in my book that I referred not to native-born citizens of Hawaii of Chinese, Japanese, Spanish and other foreign stocks, but to the Americans born in the United States. These number, according to the 1920 census, 10,816 persons, whereas the Japanese in the same census numbered 109,274.

The great disproportion between the Japanese and any other stock make it obvious that they can readily outvote the Americans. This, in turn, implies that if they should wish to obtain control, through lawful and constitutional means, of the government of the islands, they would find it easy to do so. Whether or not they will ever make the attempt no one knows. The opportunity is theirs, however.

Not until the census of 1930 is taken will it be possible to determine whether, as Mr. Adams asserts, the percentage of persons of Japanese birth or ancestry is falling. It has steadily grown up to 1920, and, unless conditions have materially changed, should continue to do so.

As for loyalty, there is little doubt of the enthusiasm of the American-born Japanese in Hawaii for the United States. But so long as Japan continues through the foreign-language schools to imbue these American citizens with a special reverence for Japan and things Japanese it is futile to pretend that she does not exercise a great hold over this largest single racial group in the islands.

Time alone will tell to what extent the experiment in assimilation in Hawaii will succeed. If, as Mr. Adams maintains, but as others deny, the Americans in the islands make no discriminations against their fellow-citizens of Japanese ancestry the process of assimilation should be speeded up. In the meantime there is nothing to be gained by being blinded to such a bald fact as that 42.7 percent of the population of the Hawaiian Islands in 1920 was classed by the United States census as Japanese.

New York City. NICHOLAS ROOSEVELT.

Activities of the White Guards

SIR: It seems clear that neither China nor Soviet Russia desires war in Manchuria. But the thousands of Bolshevik-hating Russian White Guards, scattered throughout China, intend that there shall be nothing less. Since July 10, when the Chinese authorities expelled more than one hundred Soviet officials of the Chinese Eastern Railway, ex-members of the old Tsarist armies have been swooping down upon North Manchuria like seagulls upon ships' sewage. They are reported to be inciting and parsanity, the average Catholic is inclined to regard the "noble experiment" with a healthy skepticism. Moreover, his habit of ticipating in the imprisoning, torturing, and murdering of Soviet nationals found in Chinese territory. As members or hangers-on of Chinese military forces on the Manchurian borders, and in roving contingents of their own, they have been shooting intermittently at the Soviet troops across the frontier. It is quite likely,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if a number of somewhat similar cases in the past provide any basis for surmise, that the incriminatory documents seized during the Chinese raid of May 27 upon the Harbin Soviet Consulate were forged and "planted" by expatriated Russians. Anyone who has lived in China is likely to have grown thoroughly cognizant of the White Russian campaign to destroy the regime which supplanted their own. Unfortunately their efforts now endanger the peace of the world.

One may be far more sympathetic, as I am, with China than with Russia and yet recognize the fact that in its Far Eastern policy the Soviet government has manifested, during the past two years, a forebearance which no other important power has ever duplicated. Its nationals, including even some of its consular officials, have been put to death, its economic interests have been illegally seized or hampered; in several instances its national honor has been slighted in a way which heretofore has invariably predicted war. The White Guard leaders hope that this forebearance has now reached its limit and that there is to be a Soviet resort to military reprisals. Then, with a Sino-Russian conflagration touched off, it is further hoped that the rather prompt formation of a joint military effort on the part of several of the Great Powers to overthrow Bolshevism in Russia will eventuate. It is not too early for American citizens to consider what their course should be in case the dreams of the White Guards are realized, and pressure is exerted to draw the United States of America into armed conflict with the United States of Soviet Russia.

Berkeley, Calif. HARRY L. KINGMAN.

How About Taxes?

SIR: Mr. Borsodi's "One Way Out" is nothing more than a sort of child's play, and not at all a way out.

If the multitude follows his example, the landlord will simply raise the rent until all economic advantage disappears. The greater Mr. Borsodi's success, the more certain his failure.

I am living somewhat as he is, but with no illusions as to what it all means.

Robinson Crusoe did pretty well even without tools or machines, because he had no government to rob him. But it is different with me and Mr. Borsodi. Tariff tax alone probably costs each of us a dollar a day, besides other multitudinous taxes, visbile and invisible. WM. SCOTT.

Bradfordwoods, Pa.

Race Prejudice

SIR: Mr. Bagnall's able and interesting article in a recent issue of The New Republic brings to my mind an incident that, I believe, is pertinent to the entire Negro problem in this country. Mr. Bagnall's discussion merely mentions a most serious aspect of the problem, namely the relationship of the two races and the adjustment of that relationship.

Two years ago, this month, I was travelling from New York to Chicago. The trains were crowded at that time with vacationers, and it was with difficulty that I had been able to get any Pullman reservation. But I had—a lower berth at the end of the car. I got on the train, took my seat, got my bags settled, opened a magazine and waited for the train to start. A few minutes later the porter ushered into my section the occupant of the upper berth. She was a young colored girl, not a full blood, but very dark.

I pride myself on being broad-minded, and tolerant, in so far as I can, of races and creeds other than my own. Also I labor under the delusion that I am a sociologist, and I had just put in a year in London making little comparative studies of racial differences and reading beautiful books on social adjustment and the like. I had listened to my British colleagues discuss at length the unreasonable white American attitude towards Negroes, and to a certain extent I had been convinced. And now here I was, a broad-minded, tolerant sociologist with a Negro seat-mate, and I didn't like it!

There were no vacant places in the car.

In theory there was nothing to be excited about; born free and equal—same economic status which allowed both of us in Pullman seats—freedom of opportunity, etc., etc., etc.

My vis-avis was nicely dressed, quiet, and was behaving like a lady. Pretty soon I asked her where she was going. She told me Chicago, that she had been in New York two weeks on her vacation. She was a stenographer. Then she asked me where I was going. I told her, and also added that I, too, had been vacationing in New York. I was a teacher. We both agreed we liked to visit in New York, that the theaters were wonderful, but that we were glad we didn't live where there were so many people, (the same old story that non-New Yorkers tell one another). Then I started in having an attack of hay fever. My companion was sympathetic and told me of a remarkable remedy that had helped a friend of hers who had the same affliction. I was grateful. All in all, we didn't have too bad a time socially. She was rather interesting, much more so than the perfect type of Nordic maiden across the aisle who went to dinner with me. This, however, is merely leading up to the point of my story.

The next morning in the dressing-room, a nice elderly woman (also pure Nordic) started chatting. She said: "Oh, I felt so sorry for you yesterday when I saw that colored girl in your section. I thought how awful it must be for you, and *I was so relieved when I discovered she was your maid!*"

Economically, educationally, artistically, culturally, the Negroes have undoubtedly made marvelous progress in the last two decades. Should we be distressed, thankful or just amused that our so-called deep-seated racial antipathies can be so easily dissipated?

Kittery Point, Maine. VIRGINIA DIXON DEAN.

Does Equality Mean Identity?

SIR: In demanding "a realistic rather than a dogmatic approach" to the question of legal equality between men and women in your editorial of July 24, entitled "Doctrinaire Equality," may I ask in what way "equal bargaining power" between men and women will be furthered by special legal restrictions on the number of hours a woman may work; on which hours out of the twenty-four they shall be—omitting the night hours; on the wages of a woman worker; and on the industries and trades at which a woman may work?

You ask what is a just answer to several questions regarding equality between the sexes, but some of the questions do not concern themselves with equality. For instance, you ask "who . . . would undertake the job of 'equalizing' the provisions of the Mann Act?" The Act does not deal with any question of equality. May I remind you that this law is designed to prohibit interstate traffic in women and girls for "immoral purposes" and is aimed not at the girls, but at the person or persons engaged in or conspiring with those engaged in the traffic. The convictions under it include those of women as well as of men.

You ask a just answer to "the question of compulsory jury service for women." Compulsory jury service for men allows many exemptions, varying from state to state. The advocates of equal rights ask service in this and other matters on the same terms for men and women. Jury service already exists on the same terms for men and women in seven states.

You ask, "Should the age o fconsent be the same for boys as for girls?" Since it is justice you are concerned with, could it be any less just to have the "age of consent" the same for boys as for girls than to have it different?

You express fear of the effect of an Equal Rights Amendment on "mothers'-aid laws." If you will call these laws by their true title of "children's-aid laws," they will not bother you so much. The laws are designed, of course, to give aid to children and should be so called. The grants of aid are to children and a pension has frequently been paid to a custodian who is not the mother of the children benefited. In Colorado the children's-aid law provides specifically for the payment of the pension to either parent who qualifies under the terms of the law.

Your fears of bad results from legal equality between men and women do not seem alarming, but the slow and inefficient method you suggest for obtaining part of this equality at least lays your judgment open to question.

New York City. MARY GERTRUDE FENDALL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ordeal by Reason

The Ordeal of This Generation, by Gilbert Murray. LL. D., D. Litt., F.B.A. New York: Harper and Brothers. 276 pages. $3.

AMONG the publicists of today Professor Murray holds a unique place. He comes to the discussion of current problems after years of preparation spent in the study of the civilization of the past which, by common consent, has contributed most to that of the present in intellectual stimulus, in the beauty of its conception of human life, in theories of a social state which should preserve and increase individual values, and, it may be added, in the lesson of its political errors by which its results were shattered and the advance of the race checked for a millennium. In whatever Professor Murray writes one feels in his point of view, as well as in his precision of thought and charm of style, the influence of a culture which we rightly call classic. In his discussion of the political state of civilization today, he speaks as a contemporary of Plato might speak to the men of Athens, in a new Areopagitica. Moreover, Professor Murray speaks not only with authority drawn from the past, but from experience of the present. In the effort of the last decade to make impossible another political catastrophe, in which civilization itself may well perish, he has played a notable part, and both as actor and observer has studied at close range the elements and issues involved. He must be heard.

Professor Murray's book is an argument for the League of Nations. He opens his case by positing as the one fatal error of modern civilization its emphasis upon national sovereignty as something holy and precious. This conception was the chief dogma of the political faith of the nineteenth century, and so remains today. Every high school pupil will recall, in his mediaeval history, the enthusiasm with which text book and teacher greeted the rise of nationalities and cast despite upon Holy Roman Empire and Papacy alike, upon the world of Charlemagne and St. Thomas Aquinas and Dante. The same philosophy would make him regard the American union as a mistake, and even the Articles of Confederation as a dangerous experiment. But nations exist, and the business of world politics is to work with them. Their power for mutual destruction having been so well attested, the necessity of the present generation is to limit this power at the expense of sovereignty. The effort is not to exclude strife as an element in human nature, but to abolish war as a national right.

> The war which is formally renounced in the Pact of Paris and practically guarded against in the Covenant is not an instinct, it is a form of state action. It is not an element in human nature, it is part of a political program. It is no more an instinct, or an element in human nature than the adoption of an income tax, or state-owned railways, or a protective tariff on wheat. And further, it is a form of state action which may at one time have been profitable to one of the parties engaged, but under modern conditions is indubitably disastrous to both.

The theory of the League of Nations in general is too well known, but Professor Murray's account of the way in which different phases of the enterprise were dealt with is clarifying. After the need of a League was admitted, and the necessary limitation of sovereignty accepted, the major problem was the maintenance of its authority, and the use of force to this end. Its solution was found, not in giving the League a kind of temporal power, but in an alignment of the nations composing it. "The problem is not how to concentrate somewhere sufficient force to quell a peace-breaker—that already exists; it is to produce a general state of mind in which the possessors of force will really use it for maintaining the general peace and not merely for supporting their own interests." To this end we have Articles X, XI and XVI of the Covenant, the abortive Protocol of 1924, and the so-called Kellogg pact. Professor Murray is very frank in his criticism of Great Britain for its dubious and malingering attitude toward these attempts. He condemns its refusal to ratify the Optional Clause of the Statute of the World Court, accepting the full compulsory jurisdiction of that body. He holds it responsible for the wrecking of the Protocol. He blames it for refusing to give definition to its responsibilities under Article XVI of the Covenant, binding members to take common action against a war-maker, and for its reservation to the Kellogg pact applying the doctrine of self-defense to "certain regions of the world"—a reservation which, coupled with Mr. Kellogg's own explanation that each nation "is competent to decide whether circumstances require recourse to war in self-defense," reduces the pact to practical absurdity. Professor Murray writes primarily for his own countrymen, and devotes his final chapter to proving the special and vital importance of the League to the British Empire, in the face of which exigency he declares that "ever since 1924 the debates of the League have been largely occupied in a prolonged struggle by Great Britain against most of the rest of Europe, in order to keep alive the 'right of war' and to prevent the extension of arbitration." The period corresponds to that of the late Tory government, and it is confidently expected that Mr. MacDonald will reverse its policy in these matters.

Professor Murray is also very candid in confessing the shortcomings of the League—its failure to enforce the promise to bring about disarmament; its disgraceful acquiescence in Poland's violations of good faith in the attacks on Russia and on Lithuania and the perversion of the plebiscite in Upper Silesia; its complacency in the face of outrageous persecution of minorities and the betrayal of trust by the mandate powers; its favoritism in respect to France, Italy, Great Britain and their client nations. After all, the action of the League is determined by the nations composing it. In so far as their will is bad, the League will be a failure. This reflection has served to give pause to many in this country who believe in the idea and necessity of the League in itself. What measure of good will, of honest renunciation, would this country bring to the enterprise? Is the record of the United States since the Armistice such as to encourage belief in its willingness to sacrifice anything for peace? Professor Murray asserts: "I have seen more books and speeches by Americans speaking of 'inevitable wars,' and the need to 'make oneself respected' by immense armaments, than by the nationals of any other country." At least, in no other country does the War Department conduct organized propaganda for war in the abstract and for its own sake, and teach school boys to kill and girls to reward their promise of prowess.

The novelty of Professor Murray's argument, however, lies not in his scrutiny of the League of Nations in its details but in his relation of it to the larger spiritual issues of the age. He looks back to the nineteenth century and sees the essential unity of intellectual life which made that period one of "definite form and character, in which people

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knew what to expect of the world and how to live in it"—in short, a cosmos. Liberalism in politics, general agreement as to essentials in morals, toleration in religion, he finds to be its characteristic manifestations. Even science was contributing to the sense of unity and to confidence in a predictable order of events. From this cosmos man has emerged into chaos by the gateway of war—a war which profoundly modified the character of the peoples engaged in it *en masse,* substituting for representative institutions, normal expectation of decency in conduct, and trust in reason, "aggression, violence, ruthlessness and trickery." The World War, however, was not so much a cause of the change as an indication that it was due. Among the signs that it was impending Professor Murray notes the loss of public interest in politics, so necessary to the working of liberal institutions, and the supervention, according to the evidence of the newspapers, of a mass of heterogeneous follies. Not only is the process of representative government breaking down, and with it the old social order, but the new physical science is destroying the universe of cause and effect, in which man had begun to take comfort, the new psychology is exploding the old basis of human character and ethical judgment. Everywhere there is uncertitude, disintegration, incongruity and anarchy. Never before was man under such compulsion to rebuild and reëstablish his home in the world, his civilization. And Professor Murray would have us begin "at the very spot where the nineteenth century showed its most fatal weakness"—in international relations. This is an immediate necessity, and the method of it contains the promise of the future in other fields. The League of Nations, as Professor Murray sees it, is the first step in the integration of the world, a positive advance toward cosmos out of chaos. It is the peculiar adventure of this generation—its ordeal by reason.

"The Covenant God gave us is a task."

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

French Pastry

L'Ecole des Femmes, by André Gide. Nouvelle Revue Française. Paris.

La Seconde, by Colette. Ernest Flammarion. Paris.

IT might have been expected that the recent emergence of Berlin as a cultural center equal, if not superior, to Paris in importance, would have a stimulating effect on France. Instead, the converse seems to be true, at least in so far as literature is concerned: the effect, if there has been an effect at all, has been to stifle whatever strength and virility contemporary French writing possessed. As a usual thing France could be counted on to produce one or two intelligent books either of fiction or criticism each season; this year one searches in vain through the crop for something to get excited about, finding only Julian Green's "Leviathan" and Cocteau's "Les Enfants Terrible," the first of which is essentially the work of an American, despite his earnest efforts to appear the contrary, and the second of which, while authentic enough and clever enough as a pathological case history of onanism, comes perilously near to being morbid rubbish. Aside from these two books, the rest is either all rubbish or dullness, or both. The two literary figures to whom one has been accustomed to look first, since the death of Proust, for work of first-rate craftsmanship and style and intelligence, Gide and Colette, have both labored, it is true. But they have brought forth only mice, two very small mice indeed.

M. Gide's failure is the more disappointing of the two because he is unquestionably the most important novelist in France today and because at last there can be but little doubt as to his limitations. "L'Ecole des Femmes" (singularly inept as a title in this case) purports to be the diary of an ingenuous and solemn young woman who falls in love with a fatuous prig and eventually, after twenty years of married life, discovers how very fatuous he is. The reader, unfortunately, discovers it before he has finished three pages. One suspects that M. Gide, in attempting to answer the widespread criticism that he has never yet succeeded in creating a female character who lived and breathed in his pages, would have been wiser to have left well enough alone: certainly Eveline, the protagonist, does nothing to disprove the justice of the criticism. The most charitable thing that can be said about her is that she was a simpleton who was lucky to find even Robert, humorless and pretentious bore that he was, for a husband. Neither of them, Eveline or Robert, contributes so much as a mite to the sum total of recorded human experience or knowledge; nor, for the first time in a long and distinguished career as a man of letters, does M. Gide.

The people in "La Seconde" are worse. M. Gide's failure is at least an honest one, whereas Mme. Colette appears not to have labored at all in creating her latest batch of Parisians. Either she was in a careless mood, or lazy, or over-sanguine of the results of her long delayed introduction to the land of dollars; certainly she took no pains with them; they remain always two dimensional, banal, and faintly reminiscent of Elinor Glyn. The wife of a successful playwright befriends her husband's secretary and allows her to live with them; inevitably the secretary becomes the mistress of the playwright and still goes on living in the home. The theme is the familiar one of divided loyalties, but they are loyalties which never quite come off, which are presented too sketchily, too superficially, ever to seem convincing. Moreover, the rich fecundity of style, the unashamed animality and femaleness which has characterized Colette's writing in the past, transforming her material, no matter whether it dealt with birds and bees in Normandy or scandalous old harlots in Paris, into a thing of genuine, earthy beauty, is sadly absent here. From "La Blé en Herbe" to "La Seconde" is a long, long way in retrogression: it is even a long way from "Chéri," which the United States is now discovering in pitifully inadequate translation.

Reading such books as these, one wonders why France refuses seriously to discover the War. It is a singular fact that alone of the countries which were permanently and deeply affected by the aftermath of Sarajevo, France has produced no notable fictional or dramatic treatment of war since the Armistice. "Le Feu" still remains her one first-rate contribution to war literature (perhaps, after ten years, "Le Feu" has ceased to be first-rate; I cannot say). While novels and plays and movie scenarios, good and bad, are tumbling head over heels out of Germany and England and the United States, France has only to offer an inconsiderable book by Roland Dorgélès and "Le Tombeau sous l'Arc de Triomphe," a sensational drama in verse; she remains dismally and stubbornly shut up in her ivory tower of sex; sex intellectualized or sentimentalized or specialized, but always sex. It cannot be very long now before all that is important on the subject will have been definitively said, and there will be nothing more to say.

HOWARD COXE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Father of the House of Commons

Memoirs of an Old Parliamentarian, by T. P. O'Connor. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 2 vols. 720 pages. $10.

IT is a remarkable achievement to have been an M. P. continuously since 1880; it is even more so to be the only representative of a political party which has ceased to exist. Sinn Fein killed the Irish Nationalist party, and the treaty between Great Britain and the Irish Free State made impossible its resurrection. Nevertheless, "Tay Pay" O'Connor, Irish Nationalist, retains his seat in the House of Commons.

Reading this book one understands why. Scant is the account which the author gives of himself; full and complete is the portraiture of his contemporaries. But in the painting of them Mr. O'Connor reveals his own character. Kindly and humorous throughout, he is careful to offend neither the living nor the dead. He likes almost everyone, and even for the few he dislikes there is generous acknowledgment of ability and, in general, excuse, exculpation or silence.

This book is not a history. It is a series of anecdotes, stories and personal recollections, primarily, though not exclusively, about the Irish members of Parliament, their life, their work, and their quarrels. Never was internecine party strife more bitter, more personal, more uncompromising than that which attended the dethronement of Parnell. "Tay Pay" was in the midst of it and compelled to take sides. He had known the contentious partisans on both sides for years. They were his friends before the fight and during it. They remained his friends afterwards.

The historian has long been accustomed to discount memoirs. They fail miserably in reconstructing the past; they are usually marked either by dextrous ambiguity, or by partisanship, or by both. Mr. O'Connor's memoirs, however, are an exception. They do not reconstruct the past; what memoirs do? But they help to do so. They are almost like a moving picture film. Every face stands out stark and clear. His characters are not mannikins upon which are hung laws, movements, policies; they are living men.

Concerning Gladstone, Lord Randolph Churchill, Parnell and Lord Balfour there is readily available a goodly supply of personal description. It is hardly necessary to add to that. But who knows much about how Mr. Foster, Gladstone's Secretary of State for Ireland, that burly red-haired Yorkshireman, looked or spoke? Who can describe intimately Mr. Biggar of Belfast, who began the obstructionist movement with Parnell—Biggar, "the most fearless man I have ever met," the little hunchback who spoke in the House of Commons for four hours while nearly six hundred men tried to howl him down? Then, too, there are Parnell's able lieutenants, Dillon and Sexton, the former with his saint-like face which an artist perpetuated in stained glass in a cathedral, and the latter with his big head balancing a small body, "but with eyes so blazing that they seemed to obliterate the rest of his face." Swift MacNeill, with his passion for aristocratic lineage and his bold daring in cheering the Boers after British defeat, is here, and Justin M'Carthy likewise, who sacrificed literary and social honors for the sake of Ireland. Tim Healy, bitter enemy of Parnell, who "could always interest the House of Commons," and William O'Brien of Cork, famous journalist, writing through the night in his tiny bedroom by the light of a single candle: these men we learn to know. One by one they pass us by, the wilful handful who made a farce of representative government at Westminster, who threw into confusion British politics and ultimately paved the way for an autonomous Ireland.

For ten years "Tay Pay" was the devoted follower of Parnell. To that man's genius he ascribes almost wholly the success of the Irish Nationalists. It was Parnell who taught them how to fight; and the way in which they did so is this book's central theme. Youthful for the most part, poverty-stricken with hardly an exception, shunning society, honors, lucrative employment, they stuck to their policy of obstruction. And by it they were slowly winning through.

Then came the divorce, the threat of Gladstone's resignation, hectic meetings day after day and night after night. The story has been told elsewhere, but not so well as by "Tay Pay." The red glint in Parnell's eye, his icy and indomitable will, Tim Healy's hate, old loyalties in conflict with plain common sense, and then, Parnell repudiated.

And with his death these memoirs end. Mr. O'Connor is an unusually capable and experienced journalist. He writes, it must be remembered, as an eye-witness. What he has written will interest everyone and instruct many. Only those who hold with Herbert Spencer that a man's intelligence is in inverse ratio to his interest in personalities will consider this book of no account. And certain of the latter are apt to enjoy it thoroughly, despite professional disclaimer to the contrary.

WALTER PHELPS HALL.

Church History

History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge, A Collective Work. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 780 pages. $6.50.

IS IT the reviewer's imagination, or are we beginning to get some of our most useful treatises from coöperative authorship, where specialists pool their knowledge of particular fields in a collective work of real significance? The dangers of inequality in skill have always beset such literary enterprises and doubtless always will, but the need for this type of book, if certain areas of knowledge are adequately to be covered, grows apace, and once in a while a book like the present volume achieves a distinct success.

The contributors are all scholars of high rank who honestly endeavor to play fairly with modern knowledge. The result is very unlike the old-style ecclesiastical history whose key-note was struck by a teacher in one of our theological seminaries: "In our seminary," he remarked, "we teach church history from the Episcopalian point of view." The key-note of this volume, on the contrary, is a candid recognition that the only real history is factual, not apologetic, and that any considerations of confessional opinion must adjust themselves to the discovered historical facts rather than try to manipulate them.

In consequence, the Roman Empire, as the background of the Christian movement, even when it persecuted Christians, is sympathetically appreciated and understood; the contributions to early Christianity made by the Greek philosophy and the Mystery Religions are cordially appraised; the close community of thought between Jesus and Judaism is recognized, and the life of Jesus is told

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without sentimentality in terms of the physical, social, and mental matrix of His time.

Only occasionally did the reviewer catch a shy endeavor to placate the surprised or shocked reader with a reassuring statement. In general, the forthright telling of the historical record, as modern knowledge reveals it, proceeds with dispassionate objectivity.

Of course, history is not an exact science and opinions differ. Some scholars, Dr. Burkitt's equals, for example, would charge over-emphasis on the apocalyptic element in his treatment of Jesus, and in so controversial a field as the Reformation, no essay, however balanced and fair-minded in spirit, could avoid arousing disagreement in detail.

As for relative interest, readers will probably find the earlier portions of the book more remunerative. Fields of information little known to the layman, such as the Greek Papyri and their interesting revelations, or the Apocryphal Gospels, are well set forth. As the story moves out into the record of the Roman Church, the Reformation, and modern Christianity, it traverses more familiar ground where the last few years have not been so productive of new facts. The least satisfactory portion of the book is its treatment of what is afoot now in Christianity, and the reviewer submits that unless that were going to be treated more adequately, it might well have been omitted altogether.

In general, this volume of over seven hundred pages presents an admirable survey of the genesis and development of the Christian movement. Two sorts of people in particular could well be urged to read it. First, the ultra-conservatives might profit by it—folk who still cling to the idea that Christianity is distinguished from other religions by being supernaturally let down from heaven and in some way protected from the haps and hazards of man's folly, cruelty, and ignorance. Second, the ultra-radicals might well read the book and discover that the best scientific work upon Christianity's history is being done by Christians, who refuse to identify their religion with any form of Christianity or idea within its scope that can be upset by an objective study of the historic facts.

Probably, however, neither of these two will read the work at all. It will fall into the hands mainly of those who wish in a convenient form an honest survey, written by experts, of Christianity's development, and they will find what they are looking for.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK.

Two Ways of Approaching Lincoln

The Lineage of Lincoln, by William E. Barton. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. 419 pages. $7.50.

Myths After Lincoln, by Lloyd Lewis. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 422 pages. $3.50.

UNFORTUNATELY, one of the most sincere and gallant attempts at decent portraiture of Abraham Lincoln, Senator Beveridge's recent "Life," was never completed. The Senator is dead. Have any inherited his tradition? The author of "The Lineage of Lincoln" has inherited nothing of it. Indeed, as he himself would probably be the first to remark, he was at the game long before Senator Beveridge. Dr. Barton is the author of half a dozen or more books on Lincoln, and is not unreasonably considered something of an authority on the subject. His latest contribution shows immense effort and painstaking labor, and very likely, for once and all, does away with the necessity of writing anything about the ancestry of the hero of the 1860's. But such work leaves, not only the reader, but the biographer, quite cold. For Dr. Barton belongs to the school of scholarship which indulges itself in unlimited draughts of minutiæ, large mouthfuls of carefully prepared and discreetly served nothing. Perhaps it is unkind to so painstaking a worker to belittle his work, but it is difficult to understand what possible value there can be in knowing what particular parts of England the Lincoln and Hanks families came from. Lineage is a side of biographical study which was once thought to be all-important and may still be thought so, for all we know, but we had hoped that the public was beyond caring whether or not the Lincolns and the Hankses came from London or from Zanzibar. As Abraham Lincoln, certainly the most celebrated member of the family, said, he did not make events: events made him. Of course, the marriage of one's great-great-grandfather is an event, but we prefer the events in the life of the hero. None the less, Dr. Barton has worked hard at his task, and although a constantly recurring note of self-esteem slightly mars his record of personal exploration in the region of tracts and deeds, descendants, and other often unnoted summits, he has made a book which will undoubtedly be of value to those who have need of it. We only fear that those persons will turn out to be, for the most part, the writers of academic themes and theses.

Mr. Lewis's amusing attempt to gather into being the scattered body of myth which sprang up after the death of Lincoln is a horse of another color. It is a smooth-running, well gaited horse, that comes very near to being left at the post. For Mr. Lewis's series of picturesque and colorful passages very often stakes too much on a fact or situation which is better drama than history. To begin with, in Mr. Lewis's description of the last days of the war, prior to the assassination of the President, there are many places which look like attempts to "fix" the race. Lincoln certainly did not, as Mr. Lewis implies, want peace more than victory. General Grant's terms of surrender at Appomattox could not well be described as "sweepingly generous." They were not unlike the unconditional-surrender terms of Vicksburg. Furthermore, even to stretch a point, it is hard to see how it could be said that the terms offered by Grant to Lee and by Sherman to Johnston were a contradiction of Lincoln's orders, as Mr. Lewis supposes. And apparently Mr. Lewis supposes that they were so in order to give point to his colorful story about the meeting between the President and his two generals "in the cabin of the 'River Queen.'" It is not likely that Lincoln would at that time have resorted to the "double crossing" described by Mr. Lewis, not because he was incapable of it, but because there was no need of it. Unfortunately for Mr. Lewis's book, and in spite of its breezy narrative style and its approach to the creation of a legend, this appearance of stacking the cards is too often apparent in it. But even at that it is much less confusing than many of the sober old volumes purporting to give a true picture of the six-foot-four small-town strong man who became President.

The tales of the backgrounds of the assassination, of Booth, of the Grand Army of the Republic, of the strange adventure with Lincoln's coffin, are well and interestingly told. But the reader, impressed though he may be, cannot escape the feeling that Mr. Lewis's book would have been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a better one if he had not been too much obsessed with the idea of putting a "theme song" into it. It seems to lose rather than gain by the assumption that the national attitude toward Lincoln is a response to the popular yearning for an American god.

Mr. Lewis gives the impression that, in thinking of Lincoln chiefly as a personality rather than as an intellectual force, we are doing the martyr an injustice. It is hard to understand that state of mind. It was Abraham's fearful and self-wounding conflict with himself which made him a complete personality in the end, and it was, if there is anything in evidence, the successful culmination of that conflict which gave him his chief distinction. We do not thoroughly understand what may have been the "intellectual theories of government" which Lincoln held, and which Mr. Lewis refers to at the conclusion of his chapter "The Shapes Arise." It seems to us that Lincoln had no theory of anything. He had the mind of an artist, and in the artist's half-mystic, half-empirical fashion, saw every moment as his first and last. His greatness was in his simple, untheoretical directness, his ability to read the voice behind the lips, the heart beneath the eyes, to see himself in the world about him and to take the world about him into himself. No man of any other character could so well have succeeded in handling the mad, conflicting violences of the American people and their government in 1863 and 1864. RAYMOND HOLDEN.

The Mighty Medicine

The Mighty Medicine, by Franklin Henry Giddings. New York: The Macmillan Company. 147 pages. $2.

THERE are millions, otherwise intelligent people, whose outlook on the world is still essentially that of the Middle Ages," remarks a recent editorial in The Scientific American. "Alchemy still exists in active form; its votaries publish a special journal. 'Hexing' is still rampant in one of the most prosperous regions of our nation. Plenty of people consider it just as well not to raise an umbrella in the house or walk under a ladder. A large number confuse science with pseudo-science and are easy game for all kinds of quackery purporting to cure bodily ills. Astrology is more popular than astronomy. The people of a soverign state attempt to settle by referendum vote the question whether man is a product of organic evolution; for them to attempt a popular verdict on the Einstein Theory would be no less absurd. The world has a long way to go before it can be said to have come of age."

These words might well be taken as the text of Dr. Giddings' latest book—or at least of that portion of it which follows its subject. The "mighty medicine" is superstition, occultism, the "medicine" of the shaman—what Dr. Jordan lately christened "sciosophy." And the veteran sociologist lays about him with a mighty sword as he defines and denounces the various modern aspects of ancient terror and credulity. The only difficulty is that his swashing is a bit too inclusive. "Minds which proclaim themselves liberal," he says, quite justly, "rarely are so in fact." Then he proceeds to illustrate his thesis in his own person, by including psycho-analysis and socialism among manifestations of the "occult." Whatever else they may be, neither of them is that. One is reminded of a recent writer, a great and learned man in his own field, who included relativity and the electron theory of matter among unfounded superstitions!

Aside from this minor unwisdom, Professor Giddings' expository chapters—the first seven—are admirably done. His very first words are a needed battle-cry: "In 1894 I spoke a word of warning against optimistic confidence that the long struggle for liberty of teaching was then practically ended." Would that the teachers of this generation had heeded that warning—we should not have today the spectacle of popular laws against the facts of science! And in clear and simple words he builds up admirable definitions of the aims and methods of science, and of the real meaning of organic evolution.

When it comes to advising for the future of education, Dr. Giddings is not always so fortunate in his phrasing. Even those who share with him an admiration for the old classical education, so far as it went, might be reluctant to see an even wider gulf than exists at present placed between the humanistic training of the selected few, and the manual training, civics, and English which he feels would be enough for the many. It is true that our universities are clogged with, and crippled by, the unfit for college education; but it does not follow by any means that these are representatives of the "new proletariat," the "hewers of wood" whom the author so much dislikes.

Moreover, when from his collegiate seclusion he advises opposing the anti-evolutionist forces by education in the evidences for evolution alone, he does not reckon with the sad fact that it is too late—that these fanatics are already organized and on the battle-line. The thought of Dr. Giddings planting a field and inviting the anti-evolutionists to observe the growth of the plants, to see how the stronger survive by natural selection, arouses a smile that is accompanied by a sigh. My own experience with these gentry is that they would view the field with immense calm, and then imperturbably announce that what they saw proved nothing.

On the other hand, divergencies of opinion on some phases of Dr. Giddings' views and teachings cannot blind the reader to the fact that this little book contains some immensely valuable matter. Chapters XIV, XV, and XVI, besides the first seven, should be known to every educator. Chapter XIV especially. "What the College Graduate Should Know," is full of useful suggestion. Briefly, Dr. Giddings says a college graduate should know his own language, the use of reference books, literature, history, and science. Few graduates today know any one of these things thoroughly. If we add the knowledge of at least one other language, and if possible more, I think we should have as well rounded a curriculum as any non-professional student needs. The man or woman able to profit by it would be able also to follow Dr. Giddings' valid dicta, and to point out the invalidity of some of his views. MAYNARD SHIPLEY.

A Note on Aline Kilmer

Selected Poems, by Aline Kilmer. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 66 pages. $1.50.

MRS. KILMER has separated the wheat from the chaff in her three slender sheaves—"Candles That Burn," "Vigils," and "The Poor King's Daughter"—and the threshing proves again that her too infrequent poems may not be dismissed as "occasional pieces." For the occasions are those of a genuine, if a minor, poet: her muse woos them, not they her muse.

The springs of her inspiration proceed from an underlying rock that supports instead of merely tolerating the fine soil of her cultivation, and their clear waters have a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wild tang the more piquant for the restraints her taste and artistry impose upon their flow. The lyric ideas are sometimes slight, but they are always her own; the emotions may not be very profound, but the angles of her sly espionage upon them are unique. Such poems as "Things," "Victory," "One Shall Be Taken," and "For All Ladies of Shalott" have a finality that future anthologists will cherish. And even the pieces that do not quite come off —usually from some disproportion between substance and pattern—are more refreshing in their relative failure than the relative success that, having nothing to bring off, is

content to scatter
Fine sand along a barren shore
Where there was sand enough before.

If these lines were meant as self-portraiture, Mrs. Kilmer is unduly modest. Our shores have all too little glint of such crystals as brighten the rivulets from her springs.

CLARENCE BRITTEN.

Notes on Novels

Private Secretary, by Alan Brener Schultz. New York: Simon and Schuster. 392 pages. $2.50.

A NOVEL for stenographers about a stenographer who does *not* marry the president of the company, but has a chance to and turns him down. What an army of ambitious girls will sigh and argue about that! Observers may doubt whether intrigue is quite so glittering in big business offices, or repartee quite so dexterous; whether a hard intelligent German girl like Mary would soften and refuse the handsome employer for an immature copywriter who won't even marry her. But such doubts are as nothing beside the barrage of wise-cracks, the thrill of virtue narrowly saved again and again only to be lost one weekend at Atlantic City; above all, the glory of snubbing the boss. Human nature is human nature; the formula is sound and will doubtless work—to the tune of how many thousand working girls consult Messrs. Simon and Schuster's Inner Sanctum. M. T.

Lonely Voyagers, by Wanda Fraiken Neff. Boston: The Houghton Mifflin Company. $2.50.

IT IS noteworthy that American academic life has furnished far less material for distinguished and significant fiction than English. This is undoubtedly due in part to the fact that English institutions, by virtue of age, are richer in tradition, which gives to what happens in them dignity and charm. The same explanation applies to the English church as a background for fiction as opposed to the dissenting sects of the United States. Mrs. Neff has taken one of the newer and cruder universities of the Middle West for her scene, and made her story the series of struggles, adjustments and compromises of men and women of intellectual training and ideals, with a harsh and uncompromising environment. Nearly every phase of faculty life in the institution is touched upon, except the president, for Mrs. Neff knows her occupational background thoroughly—and some of them are tragic enough. The book as a whole, however, is more impressive than its parts. The reader comes to feel the situation of this band of exiles, drawn together by their common poverty and mutual dependence, but separated by inevitable jealousy and boredom, as of a group of sailors in an unseaworthy ark on an uncharted sea—but these academic sailors have wives and children. Indeed, the complications of domestic and academic life, as Mrs. Neff shows them, almost convert one to the mediaeval idea of a university with celibacy of the faculty. But in that case, one reflects, we should have no Mrs. Neff to tell us about it with so much penetration and sympathy. R. M. L.

The Galaxy, by Susan Ertz. New York: D. Appleton and Company. $2.50.

THE Gods were singularly good to Susan Ertz. They ordained that she should be always readable. Heretofore her novels have been charming little social comedies, bright with civilized wit, but brittle and ephemeral. With "The Galaxy," however, she has staked her claim to more substantial territory and has, in fact, challenged the Galsworthy of "The Forsyte Saga." Her most recent book has a spaciousness and scope which marks a direct descent from the Victorian tradition. It is the story of Laura Alicia Deverell, who was born decorously in the 1860's, who submitted reluctantly to the tyranny of father and husband, and whose quick sensitive mind was at last fully awakened by late love. Laura is gracious, cultivated, forgivably inhibited by a rigid moral and social code, but too intelligent not to rate that code at its true worth, and to cast it off when emotional necessity demands. Miss Ertz has not only succeeded in creating an enchanting "portrait of a lady." She has evoked the picture of a whole half century without resorting to the monotonous cataloguing methods employed, for example, by Rose Macaulay in "Told By an Idiot." She has a sense of the slow flux of time. She can indicate the changes in an era by emphasizing the delicate readjustments which they effect in the minds of a small group of people. Why, then, is her book not more significant? Perhaps because it is merely an urbane comedy of manners, lacking the pity and grandeur of such a theme as gave universal dignity to "The Old Wives' Tale." When Laura dies, after a life compact of rich experience, one is aware only of the snuffing out of a lovable individual. There are no overtones to her story. One does not read into it, as in Bennett's book, the frustrations and passions of all humanity. Nor, incidentally, are there any characters in "The Galaxy" as vital and as tenaciously alive as Soames Forsyte. In an age of thin novels, Miss Ertz has achieved weight and substance. But her book lacks that touch of universality which would place it among the great. It is, one suspects, a trifle too well bred.

E. H.W.

Contributors

JAMES T. SHOTWELL is professor of Political Science at Columbia. He is now on his way to attend the Pacific Relations Congress at Kyoto.

JOHN JAY CHAPMAN is the author of "Emerson," "Greek Genius," "Dante" and other books.

G. K. CHESTERTON is the well known English journalist and author, whose latest volume of essays, "Generally Speaking," appeared last spring.

HOWARD COXE was formerly Paris correspondent of The New York Tribune and a member of the staff of The New York Evening Post.

WALTER PHELPS HALL, professor of History at Princeton University, is the author of "Empire to Commonwealth."

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK, professor of Practical Theology at Union Theological Seminary, is the author of "The Manhood of the Master," "The Meaning of Prayer" and other books.

RAYMOND HOLDEN is the author of a volume of poems called "Granite and Alabaster."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED